Summary of Decisions Requested by Submissions

Proposed Private Plan Change 37: Rider Park Structure Plan

By Topic

30 July 2026

Waipa DISTRICT COUNCIL

Readers Guide

This document is a summary of the 275 submissions received on PC37 and relief sought/decision(s) requested by them. The submission points have been divided into 17 separate topics. This summary helps readers to see all the decisions requested by topic. If you would like to see all the submissions lodged on PC37 by submitter, then refer to "Summary of Decisions Requested to Proposed Plan Change 37: Rider Park Structure Plan – By Submitter".

Call for further submissions opens on **Thursday, July 30, 2026**. The closing date for making further submissions is **5pm Thursday, August 13, 2026**. **No late further submissions will be accepted**.

Every submitter has been allocated a submitter number and each submission point is referenced by a unique number. This whole number (e.g. 1/3) is required to be referenced if you make a further submission. The list of submitters and their assigned numbers is provided on Page 4.

EXAMPLE:

Submission 1/3

1 is the submitter number

3 is the submission point number

How to read the summary

- This summary is ordered by topic. The summary lists all of the submission points on each topic that have been made by all of the submitters.
- If after looking at this summary you wish to look at all the submission points to a particular submitter then you need to refer to the "Summary of Decisions Requested to Proposed Plan Change 37: Rider Park Structure Plan by Submitter".

How to make a further submission

People can make a further submission if they represent a relevant aspect of the public interest and/or have an interest in Proposed Plan Change 37 that is greater than the interest of the general public.

A further submission can only be made in support or opposition of matters raised in the submissions. No new points can be raised.

Further submissions should be set out in the format shown in the submission form. Copies of the further submission form are available at Council offices at Cambridge and Te Awamutu, as well as online at www.waipadc.govt.nz/planchange37.

In accordance with the Resource Management Act 1991 a copy of the further submission must be sent to the person who made the original submission within five (5) working days of sending the further submission to the Waipā District Council.

The contact details of all submitters have been redacted. We have done this because increasingly people are expressing privacy concerns with having their contact details publicly available. If you need to contact a submitter Council can provide their details to you on request

Please email districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz to request the contact details of the original submitter.

Submissions can be:

Posted to:	**Delivered to:**		**Emailed to:**
Waipā District Council Private Bag 2402 Te Awamutu 3840	Waipā District Council Te Awamutu Office 101 Bank Street Te Awamutu	Waipā District Council Cambridge Office 23 Wilson Street Cambridge	districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz

Topic List

(note: click on relevant topic heading below to be taken to starting page for that topic. Click on return to topic list to come back to this page)

General 6
Rural Land 10
Infrastructure and Sequencing 15
Development Capacity 42
Business Land 44
Waikato River Access 45
Open Space 46
Reverse Sensitivity 46
Traffic 47
Ecology 66
Cultural Heritage 72
Character 74
Stormwater Management 79
Amenity Values 80
Acid Sulphate Soils 82
Structure Plan 82
Proposed Provisions 84

List of Submitter Names and Numbers

1	Emma Hobbs
2	John Bushell
3	Michelle Harker
4	Megan Vuglar
5	Sally-Ann Nelson
6	Belinda Myers
7	Tylah Hewald
8	Rachel Le Normand
9	Nicky Bowden
10	Deborah Hunter
11	Mary Jo Doherty
12	Brendon D'Ath
13	Kim Brosnahan
14	Katja Mattu
15	Joanne Miller
16	Beau Yeandle
17	Otis Walker
18	Christina Hanna
19	Kathryn Roderick
20	Steve Johnston
21	Peter Bridgens
22	Roddy Kerr
23	Jessica Short
24	Jillian Murdoch
25	David Garmonsway
26	Giacomo Thomas
27	Peter Loyd
28	Elaine Jones
29	Bronwyn Page
30	Suzanne Francis
31	Wendy Kenny
32	Ashleigh Smith
33	Isabel Steel
34	Hannah Osborne
35	Anthony Allen
36	Heather Neels
37	Elizabeth Mackenzie
38	Jayde Morgan
39	Troy Roger
40	Marie Hunt
41	Lisa Dalton
42	Angelique
43	Sonya Davis
44	John Smith
45	Pete Bell
46	Renee Wilkinson
47	Melissa Miller
48	Patrick Geraghty
49	Michael Broadley
50	Alma Abrahams
51	Andrew Sparks
52	Hayley Rahman
53	Ailene McLaren
54	Andy Marsden
55	Thersa Kiff
56	Ava Pyper
57	Shelley McSwinney
58	Andrew Ryan
59	Robert Kingston
60	Gerda Venter
61	Poi Haere Veelenturf
62	Hamish Moore
63	Tracey Blackwell
64	Kellee Raubenheimer
65	Nikki Monk
66	Hope Spooner
67	Teresa Gillies
68	Jayne Signal
69	Alex Ball
70	Melanie Benge
71	Vicki Fleming
72	Samantha Fairweather
73	Natasha & Jack Blunden
74	Stephanie Morgan
75	Alison Hucke
76	Juliann Kury
77	Andrea Montague
78	Diane Sharpe
79	Donna Devcich
80	Jayne Hartstone
81	James Seivwright
82	Janette Mannell
83	Megan Silson
84	Kenneth Coveny
85	Virginia Spoors
86	Gemma Oneil
87	Gurm
88	Julie Davidson
89	Stephen Collins
90	Terry Handcock
91	Chris Kibblewhite
92	Angela Chilcott
93	David McCathie
94	Graeme Rawlings
95	Denise Weatherby
96	Michael Morton
97	Geoffrey Boxall
98	Joshua Cox
99	Lena Cox
100	Eileen Hawkins
101	Lyndall Hermitage
102	Bob Russell
103	Russell & Anna Malone
104	Ian E Willers
105	Beale
106	Denise Whybrow
107	Kathleen Greed
108	David Greed
109	Doug McMullin
110	Michael Bland
111	Janet Bland
112	Marijn Anne-Lies Roberts
113	Carrie Aspin & Gordon Thom
114	Mark Searle
115	Ben Segal
116	James Finch
117	Meagan Wrinch
118	Elaine Hunt
119	Colin & Linda King
120	Robert Lichtwark
121	Carolyn Mackenzie
122	Deborah Keep
123	Stephen Dolan
124	Elizabeth Harvey
125	David Duffy
126	Beryl Pears
127	Alister Kennedy
128	Phillip Warmerdam
129	Rupert Kaye
130	Pauline Weinberg
131	Alan Dahlberg
132	Robert Walsh
133	Paul Cross
134	Wendy Warmerdam
135	Jeffrey Bennett
136	Faye Baldwin & Josh Manuel
137	Judith Boeren
138	Nigel Slater
139	Bernice Sherry
140	John Francis
141	Teagan Newton
142	Donna Southcombe
143	Julie Redder
144	Director General of Conservation
145	Laurence Lacey
146	Ray & Maxine Nelson
147	Glen Bruce
148	Hamish Hobson
149	Mary Francis
150	Penny Pickett
151	Christine Greer
152	Christine Greer
153	Miranda Alexander
154	Mark Kirsopp
155	Claudia Higginbotham
156	Jill Burns
157	Nathan Vassella
158	Mervyn Cronin
159	Lyndsay Mason
160	Edward Mason
161	Leamington Rugby Sports Club Incorporated
162	Christine Lewell
163	Margaret Henwood
164	Trevor & Mandy Morris
165	Andrea Kewish
166	Jeanette Boswell
167	Rolf Boswell
168	Jane Evans
169	Debbie Towers
170	Leanne Bell
171	Graeme & Ngaire Mead
172	Shona Munro
173	Ernest Munro
174	Jessie Grubner
175	Tony McIsaac
176	Alison Storey & Paul Dutton
177	Rebecca Hardisty
178	Claire Scouse
179	Lisa Dalton
180	Adam Jones
181	Robina Cummins
182	Julia Raupi
183	Heather Colgan
184	Hongfa Xu (Michael)
185	Mark Spoors
186	Lucy Robinson
187	Phoebe Spoors
188	Tim Bradshaw (Patricia Seddon)
189	Brook Robertson
190	Johanna Buckley
191	Dion Williams
192	Paul & Pamela Fraser
193	Shannon Slight
194	Tyron Pini
195	Wayne Monds
196	Hugh & Maureen Bobbett
197	Eleanor Laugeray-Cleaver
198	Kellie Watson
199	Wayne Eagleton & Jean Goodbrand
200	Vivian O'Kane
201	Marizka Garrett
202	Rosemary Tua
203	Kere McKinnon
204	Dorothy Curtis
205	Philip McHugh
206	Johnathan Bayley
207	Dorothy Gaunt
208	Rodney Cooper
209	Diane Amptmeyer
210	Robyn Reilly
211	Karen Foster
212	Marcia Baildon
213	Celine Kearney & Andy Hammon
214	Maureen Sheehan
215	Paul & Lynette Garland
216	Lynton Rhoda
217	Paul Richman
218	Kate Fitz-John
219	Lucy Hurley
220	Lucy Holdaway
221	Alexander Hill
222	Gayna McConnell
223	Nicholas Hockey
224	David Cowley
225	Simone Williams
226	Morgan Young-Schwab
227	James Nguyen & Leah Crawford
228	Ellen Hockey
229	Fire and Emergency New Zealand
230	Julia Bone
231	Jennifer Linney
232	Cambridge Golf Club Incorporated
233	Graham Casey
234	Kate Moyna
235	Bruce Hancock
236	George Payne
237	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
238	Scott Montagu
239	Martin O'Brien
240	Cambridge Chamber of Commerce
241	Kelvin Dunn
242	Peter Martin
243	Eunice Martin
244	Mary McPhee
245	Lynette Cumming
246	Christine Manson
247	Trevor Swan
248	Heather Swan
249	Robert Bailey
250	Denise Ferguson
251	Andrew Hardy
252	Ian & Karen Covell
253	Cambridge Community Board
254	Mark Gilles
255	Kate Ball
256	Glenda Whitehead
257	Gareth Moran & Simone van Asbeck
258	Martina Brown
259	Michael Ford
260	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated
261	David Dugmore
262	Michael & Leisa Hurley
263	Lisa Dudfield
264	Carole Mayo & Judith Toka
265	Andrew Farrell
267	Diane Hartwell
268	Waipā District Council
269	Andrew Myers
270	Federated Farmers of New Zealand - Waikato
271	Leasa Hubbard
272	Kyle Knight
273	Te Tāhuhu o te Mātauranga / Ministry of Education
274	Waikato Regional Council
275	Sommer Gisborne
276	Alan Warburton (Late Submission)

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

General

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
1/1	Oppose	General	I do not understand how Cambridge will support that many new families and homes. It will no longer be the sweet small town it is now. We can not sustain the current population.	More supermarkets, parking and schooling.
15/1	Oppose	General	No permission to expand.	To not allow permission to expand any more of Cambridge.
18/1	Support in Part	General	I support this plan change if it enables: • new space for community amenities (cafe, pharmacy, kindergarten, playgrounds etc) in this part of Leamington (which currently has very limited amenities) • walkable neighbourhoods • connected, protected cycle lanes, • native landscaping and green infrastructure connections and networks to support the Maungatautari and Waikato river • Blue green infrastructure networks and cultural landscapes through appropriate place/street names. This is an opportunity to create a vibrant, sustainable neighbourhood that supports mobility and service provision to enable a 15-minute city approach on this side of town- which is currently in an amenity/service deficit unless motor vehicles are used. I support the medium density approach and would like to see provision for community gardens/maara kai, ecological playgrounds and reserves to balance the higher density.	Clear indication of how this development will be strategically planned to meet the needs of the wider area, integrate with existing networks (ecological, infrastructure and transport) and enhance liveability of the town.
32/1	Support	General	I think the use of this land is great. The provision of new homes and positive development of Leamington is appealing. Including the green areas also brings an extra appeal for current residents in Cambridge, and providing a connection to the river as an optional recreation space.	Please allow for the provision of a new school and shops to suit the addition of people. I don't think that Leamington school could cope with this increase. A third bridge and public transport systems are required to also cope with the extra people.
61/1	Oppose	General	Turn into a commercial area with some essential services (grocery, fuel station, chain stores) we already have so many residents in Cambridge and Leamington and having to travel to Hamilton for a lot of things to avoid the congestion of people and vehicles in Cambridge	Take it into consideration
63/1	Support in Part	General	All new builds must be environmentally friendly. They must have solar, wastewater management & free water collection ability as a minimum requirement	Ensure new housing is not putting additional stress onto current structures.
64/2	Oppose	General	This is also going to have a big impact on the environment- sustainable housing, power & rainwater options should be mandatory for future developments. How are we supporting public transport and mitigating air pollution impacts of the population increase?	Not specified
73/1	Support	General	I support this development overall but its covenants need to centre around sustainability. I would like to see the houses in the subdivision be equipped with: • some form of solar power, • EV charging and good access. • Rainwater tanks should also be installed on properties in the development. • The streets should be wide enough to accommodate vehicles that are parked as well as emergency services, too often now we see single lane rights of ways servicing upwards of 10 homes that also have single car garage. The reality is most families have two cars, leading to clogged streets and dangerous situations emergency access to homes is restricted. • Having living areas on the street frontage, whilst common as a requirement in Waipa, reduces the privacy of those living in high density areas. Ability for the residents to be able to walk or cycle to local amenities and to have public transport connections to the wider district and region.	Include sustainability in the covenanting and ensure good access to properties.
81/1	Support	General	I think this is a great place to build houses in the Cambridge area, the town is already growing rapidly on the other side of town, so why not expand on the Leamington side, more housing is needed going forward in the future, and there is a good a place as any.	I seek that the council give the green light on the proposed operation

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
85/1	Oppose	General	I moved to Cambridge 3 years ago and drive through Leamington every day. I am concerned that the Council is allowing development to get ahead of infrastructure. In the 3 years that I have been here Cambridge no longer feels like the small rural town that it was. There appears to be very little planning around how to support growth. I would prefer to see development on the northern side of town so that the rural aspect can be preserved and there is less pressure on infrastructure and roading.	To decline the medium density zoning proposal
87/1	Oppose	General	I have looked at the plan change and do not agree with this being a good idea for anyone except the current landowner and anyone associated with the planning process that they will utilise to make these changes. I understand it is in the Councils interest to make the change due to unsustainable spending that has been happening and that looks like it is becoming a normal expectation now. Current infrastructure has no capability to sustain this increase in planned housing even if it did seem like a good idea.	I wish council to leave the current plan in place and make no changes.
104/1	Support	General	I think it should be allowed and encouraged as like most towns Cambridge has tended to grow to the North and towards Hamilton at the risk of becoming a suburb of Hamilton. One the biggest attractions for people to come and live here is Lake Karapiro which is a world class venue and I think encouraging growth in that direction will benefit Cambridge long-term making it probably the only town in the North Island potentially featuring a world class lake.	Pass it as proposed.
116/1	Not Specified	General	Fine with more residential area since town belt is kept, but if there is a public shopping area keep it as a high street not one of those god awful parking lots with shops around the outside. All character lost when a parking lot is at the centre.	if there is a public shopping area keep it as a high street
146/1	Support	General	We support the proposed Private Plan Change because it provides an opportunity to deliver additional residential capacity in Cambridge while enabling the development of a well-planned neighbourhood environment. The expanded development area helps retain the ability to incorporate community infrastructure and neighbourhood amenities as part of the overall development design and enables: • additional residential capacity for Cambridge • the development of a well-functioning urban environment • the provision of neighbourhood centres, open space networks and active transport connections opportunities for community infrastructure to develop alongside residential growth	That Council approve Private Plan Change 37 for the Rider Park development, including the expanded development area.
149/1	Oppose	General	Proposed plan change 37 does not go ahead and Rider Park remains deferred residential zone.	No changes, remain as is.
181/1	Oppose	General	Adequate mitigation of negative impacts cannot occur under a plan that has two commercial zones and medium density housing that is placed in a grid-like pattern over the landscape after large tracts of the existing ecosystem have been destroyed. Change the way we reach our decision, so that the most important entity in this decision is the whenua, the land itself, with all its attached history, ecology, spirituality etc. We then make decisions that are gentle on the whenua and in doing so empower people who are linked to the whenua, i.e. members of the surrounding community. If one views the various impact assessments and comes up with a solution to mitigate each adequately the framework you end up with is incompatible with 98 hectares of medium density housing.	Reject the proposal. Give the opportunity to individuals to join with Tony to come up with a new plan that enables a lighter footprint on the whenua of Rider Park. Aid application into rezoning into an appropriate category of zone.
181/2	Oppose	General	In an ideal world how would Rider Park be developed so that the development could have a light footprint, including: • dwellings lightly scattered across the site so birds and bats can still live there. • Beautiful tree plantings retained (as well as additional ones added) • Some fencing retained • Aspects important to mana whenua accentuated • Fewer dwellings = less infrastructure (having their own water tanks and source of electricity) • sustainable homes sited to make best use of the suns energy and made of materials such as rammed earth. • Grey water recycling. • Larger sections could include a tiny home or several tiny homes • Composting toilets used • Grassy tracks across the site enhancing walking, running and horse access Guided horse tours and other nature / cultural tourism ventures	Reject the proposal. Give the opportunity to individuals to join with Tony to come up with a new plan that enables a lighter footprint on the whenua of Rider Park. Aid application into rezoning into an appropriate category of zone.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
181/4	Oppose	General	Were the proposed plan changes to go ahead and subsequent development or subdivision be implemented, the effect (detrimental in nature) on one of the few remaining areas of beauty and serenity within Cambridge would be huge. Areas of Concern: • Increased traffic flows - Wordsworth Street, Carlyle Street, Lamb Street • loss of serenity and beauty • damage to ecosystems • Increased stormwater runoff • Increased infrastructure requirements • Introduction of commercial centres into a residential area • Insufficient engagement of the local population • A radical change in the 'feel of the area', the ambience of the area from being an area of recreation to just another housing development • loss of safety due to increased traffic Happy to provide more detail on certain issues in oral presentation at the hearing.	Reject the proposal. Give the opportunity to individuals to join with Tony to come up with a new plan that enables a lighter footprint on the whenua of Rider Park. Aid application into rezoning into an appropriate category of zone.
183/1	Support	General	I am in favour of the change to residential of Rider Park as there is strong demand for low-medium cost housing in Leamington.	• The protection of natural resources and landscapes important landscapes i.e. gully east of Leamington cemetery. • The reduction of energy by implementing compulsory solar energy for private housing as well as street lighting. • Traffic calming measures installed on Maungatautari Rd where the speed changes from 50 to 80km. • Specific amount of landscapes to be designated for reserve / playground and Commercial operations.
199/1	Oppose	General	It was disappointing to read that this plan change was originally declined by the Waipa DC several years ago and that the owners were recently approached by the council to re-submit. Notwithstanding the other developments in Cambridge which are already adding pressure to our town's services, we strongly object to the proposal for this plan change.	We seek to request the Council declines the application for the plan change affecting the 52.89 hectares currently designated rural - and that the land remains designated rural.
211/3	Oppose	General	Cambridge & Leamington are slowly losing green belt for extra housing. Rates will increase for the WDC to pay for the extra amenities that will be needed. Enough is enough. Is the Council being greedy? And what about a third bridge to cope with the increase in traffic.	Not specified
214/1	Oppose	General	Mr Tony Rider is not an expert in development as he is a thoroughbred breeder. Why does he want to spoil the charm of Cambridge. I can't see the value to anyone except Mr Rider. Such a shame to destroy what Cambridge is.	Oppose
22/1	Support	General	This proposed development will complement the growth of Leamington and the wider Cambridge area. Change and growth are constants in this world. Growth in this area may challenge dwellers to seek an alternative route to work in Hamilton by making use of Kaipaki Road and on to Hamilton. I am impressed with the latest subdivisions for housing and trust the Council planners will ensure the plan to incorporate areas for parks, shops and amenities to suit the projected growth.	Please make provisions for public transport, with bus stops and the ability to accommodate the current fleet of buses.
220/1	Support in Part	General	I am a member of the Leamington Community gardeners, and wanted to be assured that our group will still have the same access to the area we lease and use on Wordsworth Street.	Assured access to the area we lease and use on Wordsworth Street
234/1	Oppose	General	This development is unnecessary. It does not solve any problems currently faced in the Waipa District. This development is designed to make private profit. The people who need homes will not be building in a new development. Stating that this development will bring a third bridge into being is absolutely backwards - but a brilliant sales technique.	The proposed private plan change to Rider Park should be dismissed entirely
240/1	Support in Part	General	The Chamber supports growth across the Waipā district and recognises the importance of enabling residential development to meet ongoing demand. We support well-managed, well-sequenced growth that is aligned with infrastructure, environmental considerations, and community needs.	Key considerations are identified so that those responsible—supported by their technical expertise—can ensure appropriate mitigation, particularly where cumulative effects may impact the wider community. Further clarity and assurance sought across several key areas before forming a definitive position, including. • How does PC37 align with the Waipā 2050 Growth Strategy and Future Proof sequencing?

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
				• How does this development interact with other planned or consented growth areas?
240/5	Support in Part	General	The Chamber considers that insufficient detail has been provided to fully understand the implications of the proposal. Without this specificity, it is difficult to assess the long-term impacts or effectiveness of mitigation measures.	Provide greater detail and transparency to enable informed decision-making and community confidence. Areas requiring further clarity include: • Public access and permeability • Provision, quality, and accessibility of public open spaces • Staging of development and infrastructure sequencing Assessment of cumulative and consequential effects
240/6	Support in Part	General	Connectivity with the wider community. New development must be well integrated into the existing urban fabric - accessible, functional and connected. This includes connectivity to Cambridge CBD, Leamington centre, Employment hubs such as Hautapu, Existing and future transport networks	Demonstrate how the development will achieve strong recreational, social, and economic connectivity with the wider Cambridge community.
249/2	Support in Part	General	The application is on the basis of providing affordable accommodation in line with Government Policy. In that case there must be a strong argument for Government to provide a substantial contribution to the construction costs.	Not specified
251/1	Oppose	General	This is not a Council project, it's private and for profit. A subdivision of this size would attract 5 to 10k new residents, Cambridge is already at capacity with its current population and the need for infrastructure must be a priority for Council.	Do not give this proposal any more time, Keep Cambridge, Cambridge not some Hamilton suburb
253/10	Oppose	General	While the Board supports well-managed, well-sequenced growth in principle, it does not consider that PC37, as proposed, has demonstrated sufficient justification to bring forward deferred land, rezone highly productive soils, or adequately address infrastructure, environmental, and intergenerational impacts at this time. A significant portion of the PC37 land is currently identified within the Deferred Residential C5 Growth Cell, signalling later-stage development under existing growth sequencing. While the Board supports the broad intent of Ahu Ake – Waipā's Community Spatial Plan, including compact, contiguous growth, it seeks clarity on how the proposed acceleration of this growth area aligns with Ahu Ake's emphasis on sequenced, infrastructure-led development and risk management.	Assurance is sought that PC37 represents a considered implementation of Ahu Ake, rather than a departure from the agreed sequencing signals that underpin community expectations, infrastructure planning and long-term investment decisions.
259/2	Oppose	General	It is well time for a brake to be put on the seemingly uncontrolled housing plans established in recent years. None of this has in any way improved the character and lifestyle of our town. Argument that more ratepayers would reduce rates have proved groundless. We do not have to be big to be better.	That approval be declined.
265/1	Oppose	General	The local community, need the full details of what is being proposed in a clear and readily understood format, this must include traffic plans, (as the council have a very poor record on this), what is being built with the house or is it the usual developer freeloading off what is here, what improvements are being made to services in town, in short detailing how this huge development will improve this area.	Provide full details, including all infrastructure upgrades and improvements to be completed before this developments starts and a detailed breakdown of who is paying for what. This should be given a reasonable time for review, say three months upon issue of this single detail document and include several council/public reviews and updates.
273/1	Neutral	General	The Ministry is committed to working constructively with Waipā District Council and the plan change applicant to refine provisions that support integrated, well-functioning communities. If approved, early engagement around staging, timing and development of the area will be important to inform major investment decisions around the investment in existing school sites nearby and their ultimate development to respond to growth. The Ministry has an ongoing interest in: • How development is planned and sequenced, particularly in terms of infrastructure provision such as roading as this will impact the connectivity to existing local schools. • The relevant provisions specifically acknowledging and providing for schools. This is critical given schools are an essential piece of social and community infrastructure. An absence of supportive provisions can place obstacles in the way of establishment of education facilities in future years. • How safe walking and cycling infrastructure within the development and to and from existing local schools will be planned and delivered. The urban form and amenity provided through connected and usable areas of public open space.	The following relief and any consequential amendments required to give effect to the matters raised in this submission, including the following amendments to the Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone and Section 21 - Assessment Criteria of the Waipā District Plan: • Add a new objective 2A.3.8.1.a to read: *"to recognise and provide for schools and early learning services as essential community infrastructure necessary to support the rider Park Structure Plan Area"*. • Amend Policy 2A.3.8.2 to include *"education facilities"* as an example of an activity that provides for the health and well-being of the community and that service or support an identified local need • Amend Rule 2A.4.1.3 to add a new Restricted Discretionary Activity for *"Primary and Secondary Schools"* • Amend Discretionary Activity Rule 2A.4.1.4.d to refer to *"Other"* education facilities Add new Restricted Discretionary Activity Assessment Criteria 21.1.2A.25.a to provide the following matters that Council discretion is restricted to

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
				include *"site planning and design, noise and operational effects, transport and access, infrastructure servicing, and safety and amenity.*

Rural Land

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
5/5	Oppose	Rural Land	We should be protecting our precious wai and the nearby pa site, looking after Papatūānuku and the taonga that is our rural land.	To not allow development surrounding the nature reserve and pa site.
6/1	Oppose	Rural Land	The land and the drive to Karapiro should be kept rural.	To not allow this subdivision
8/1	Oppose	Rural Land	I am very opposed to this. More prime rural land going into houses that Cambridge cannot support.	That council do not rezone this land.
39/1	Oppose	Rural Land	Turning good farmland that has top tier soils into housing.	Oppose everything that has been applied for.
44/1	Oppose	Rural Land	I oppose the rezoning of productive pasture to residential. In times where productive land could be better utilised for food growth. Expanding a town outwards does more harm than good reduction of productive land for food.	Do not rezone this land. Encourage productive use of it
47/3	Oppose	Rural Land	I oppose the development due to the continue expansion into Rural Areas.	To prevent the development of Milian Park stud.
50/2	Oppose	Rural Land	Ridiculous idea cutting up more of the countryside for profit when there is enough houses being built to match the demand.	Reject the proposal for more building of houses in the area for some substantial time.
55/3	Oppose	Rural Land	I value the open space between Leamington and Lake Karapiro and fear the cost of losing fine productive agricultural land, which once built on is lost forever.	Reject completely Proposed Private Plan Change 37 - Rider Park Structure Plan and rezone the land to Rural.
56/5	Oppose	Rural Land	Loss of productive rural land: The rezoning would result in the loss of productive land. These effects have not been adequately avoided, remedied, or mitigated.	Primary relief: Decline Private Plan Change 37 in its current form.
82/4	Oppose	Rural Land	is this the best use of this land? It appears to be prime agriculture land and the current challenges we are facing due to the US/Israel war on Iran are showing us just how reliant we have become on a global economy. Perhaps there is increasing value in food production for the local economy and maybe putting more houses on this type of land is thinking too short-term.	I would like the council to decline this current request until robust, evidence based information is sought by the current landowner and communicated to the current ratepayers for a second round of submissions if the landowner wishes to resubmit at that point
87/2	Oppose	Rural Land	This land is currently utilised for productive farming use and Cambridge has enough current building locations planned out for the near future and therefore it should be left as it is. It is important that we don't just take all the arable land we have and build unnecessary housing on it, just because someone is going to make money. Enough brown field sites are currently being used and the greenfield areas that have been changed over recently have huge capacity for the time being.	I wish council to leave the current plan in place and make no changes.
91/3	Oppose	Rural Land	Violation of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL) PC37 seeks to rezone 52.89 hectares of currently Rural-zoned land. This land is characterized by high quality soils and is currently utilized for productive equine and grazing activities. The NPS-HPL provides clear direction to protect New Zealand's most versatile land from fragmented urban sprawl. Converting this productive primary production land into a medium-density suburb is an irreversible loss to the district's agricultural economy and contradicts national directives aimed at ensuring long-term food and economic security.	I seek that the Waipa District Council decline Private Plan Change 37 in its entirety.
96/3	Oppose	Rural Land	The land is ideal for farming/equestrian use and should remain that way. Too much good arable land is being rezoned to housing.	Decline the rezoning of the 98.6 hectares of land to Medium Density
97/1	Oppose	Rural Land	Too much prime land is being built on and, thus, the environment is affected by reduced green areas and their plants, trees and general vegetation. Extra building in the Cambridge area is damaging to its image - which is already being degraded by the excising expansion of the town.	Permission for the proposed subdivision be declined
107/2	Oppose	Rural Land	The roads in Leamington are busy enough now without unnecessary houses been built on land that should be used for agricultural purposes.	Rezoning 52 hectares of land adjoining the C5 growth cell from rural zone to medium density residential zone is declined

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
108/4	Oppose	Rural Land	Too much existing farmland (which should be productive and contributing to the wider economy) is being swallowed up for development such as this proposal. Once turned into residential subdivisions the economy loses out forever - our community and country will be the poorer for it.	That the proposal in its entirety, be denied and that the status quo remains.
112/3	Support in Part	Rural Land	I understand the need for Cambridge to expand, and if point 1 gets adequately addressed/answered have no objections to the rezoning of the 45ha of C5 growth cell from Deferred Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. Rezoning 52 hectares of land adjoining this zone, in particular the northern half of this area (from the gully, adjacent to the pa site and up to the Waikato) feels flawed. This area provides breathing space to the area, for indigenous flora and fauna, and residents. Living close, I've always experienced this space as one of the hidden gems of Cambridge. And IF it were to change that newly identified northern area from rural to residential Why MDRZ on this particular area. Why develop over areas of cultural / archaeological significance, encroaching in an area with natural/biodiversity significance. Why not designate that area for a reserve, for people to enjoy green space, and connect to the river. And focus urban development more on the flat pasture land east of the proposed zone?	A reconsideration of the plan change of the 52ha north/east of the C5 growth cell. Don't extend the zone all the way to the river, but consider sections of land to the east of the proposed zone.
126/2	Oppose	Rural Land	The proposal does impact productive rural land which is already under pressure.	Do not consent to this request for change of designation in part or in whole.
129/1	Oppose	Rural Land	This is a scenario which will involve turning current farm land into residential building land and at present, there is a clear plan and path in place to allow for this in a controlled manor. The council does not require additional land at this time and so to start a process such as this, will take usable farmland out of service and will also be allowing building in a zone that has so far not been allowed.	Leave the zoning as it is currently.
130/2	Oppose	Rural Land	It will spoil our outlook for all the visitors that head out to the lake for events. It would be a shame to cut up all the beautiful countryside.	Please don't go ahead with this plan
139/1	Oppose	Rural Land	Loss of prime agricultural land for housing and more concrete and asphalt roading.	Do not allow this plan change to be accepted.
143/3	Oppose	Rural Land	The land is also prime farmland and close to Karapiro lake , this land is vital for global warming and other environmental protection measures.	No provisions / leave the farmland as is
154/2	Oppose	Rural Land	Expansion of the town boundary into agricultural land as proposed materially changes the nature of the township and will destroy the natural feel of the stream walkway which runs adjacent to the proposed development.	Decline the submission
163/2	Oppose	Rural Land	This is on prime rural land, this would be a loss of productive farmland.	I seek a rejection of the proposal for the rezoning of this land by Milan Park Stud, the original smaller deferred growth expansion plan be adhered to as outlined in the existing District Plan, the majority of this land be retained as productive farmland and the character and ambience of Cambridge be protected.
166/2	Oppose	Rural Land	New Zealand has a limited supply of good agricultural land and I am strongly opposed to the loss of this good agricultural land for housing.	Council should oppose the re-zoning of the land in question from Deferred Residential Zone and Rural Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone and oppose the change in extent of the C5 growth cell.
167/2	Oppose	Rural Land	New Zealand has a limited supply of good agricultural land and I am strongly opposed to the loss of this good agricultural land for housing.	Council should oppose the re-zoning of the land in question from Deferred Residential Zone and Rural Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone and oppose the change in extent of the C5 growth cell.
172/1	Oppose	Rural Land	Turning rural land into residential, effecting the rural aspect of the area I reside in.	To not let this submission go ahead
176/2	Oppose	Rural Land	The development of 4-5 storey apartment blocks, street lighting, through roads, and commercial premises in a currently zoned rural area would inherently impact the lifestyle, levels of light and traffic pollution and ability to move around that current Maungatautari residents experience.	We ask Council to retain the deferred development of the C5 growth cell until 2035 and not allow the remainder of the property to be rezoned from rural to medium density residential.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			The effect on the rural landscape (which is why people choose to live in the area) has been declared moderate, though the PC37 report illustrates the majority of immediate neighbours either oppose the plan change or not having their view confirmed - we feel this should hold a very high weighting in this process.	
202/1	Oppose	Rural Land	I don't agree with rural productive land being rezoned for housing. Particularly when the Council is already planning housing nearby. The housing is not required. In nearby Pukekura subdivision some housing has taken up to 3 years to sell. There is no demand for this housing. Once you convert productive farm land to housing you can't convert it back.	The Council should not approve this change to plan due to the importance of maintaining rural land.
211/2	Oppose	Rural Land	Beautiful farmland being chopped up.	Not specified
215/5	Oppose	Rural Land	The proposal results in the loss of highly productive soils, which is an irreversible effect and should only occur where clearly justified and aligned with long-term planning strategy.	Decline the plan change in its current form
218/8	Oppose	Rural Land	The loss of highly productive soils is another serious concern. The proposal appears inconsistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL), and no adequate assessment has been provided to address this. Why was a NPSHPL report not submitted with the application?	Decline the application.
219/2	Oppose	Rural Land	My key concerns are loss of rural character, open space and productive land.	That the Proposed Private Plan Change 37 be declined in full
221/3	Oppose	Rural Land	My concerns are loss of rural character, open space and productive land	I seek that the Proposed private plan change 37 be declined in full
225/2	Oppose	Rural Land	My understanding of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land is that it focuses on the ability of land to support primary production over the long term. In this case, I am concerned that the rural land being rezoned appears to have the characteristics of productive land, and that rezoning it would permanently remove its ability to be used for primary production. I am concerned that: • The land appears to form part of a wider area of productive rural land surrounding Cambridge, and its rezoning would contribute to a reduction in the availability of that resource. • The land appears to form part of a wider area of productive rural land surrounding Cambridge, and its rezoning would contribute to a reduction in the availability of that resource. • The way fragmentation has been described in the application may understate the productive potential of the rural land. In my view, the fact that the rural land may become more separated from other areas does not necessarily mean it is no longer capable of supporting productive uses. • The rezoning of the rural zoned land may have indirect effects on the productive use of adjoining rural land. In particular, the introduction of urban activities at the rural interface has the potential to create constraints on established primary production activities, reduce operational flexibility, and contribute to the fragmentation of the wider rural land resource. The assessment may not reflect the long-term and cumulative effects of losing this type of rural land.	I oppose the proposed plan change
225/3	Oppose	Rural Land	The proposal has not demonstrated that the loss of this land is necessary. In particular, it has not been clearly established that: • sufficient development capacity cannot be achieved elsewhere; • there are no reasonably practicable alternative locations; and the loss of productive capacity is justified in the long term.	I oppose the proposed plan change
225/4	Oppose	Rural Land	Rezoning this land would remove its ability to support land-based primary production on a permanent basis, and may also compromise the ongoing productive availability of adjoining rural land, without clear justification that this outcome is necessary or consistent with the intent of national policy.	I oppose the proposed plan change
228/3	Oppose	Rural Land	The development will reduce the availability of productive land that would otherwise be able to be used for grazing or crop growing. New Zealand rural productive land is decreasing significantly as population growth increases and whilst I understand the need to meet housing demands, I do not agree that urban sprawl is the answer.	I am seeking council to not allow the proposed changes to be approved
23/2	Oppose	Rural Land	The extra loss of precious agricultural land. New Zealand has 5% class 1 and 2 soils why is more been proposed for destruction in the face of climate change.	To oppose this change and stop this going ahead

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
231/5	Oppose	Rural Land	On a broad scale as every town extends it residential boundary, it is encroaching on fertile farmland that is slowly reducing the food bowl potential for this country. The current political situation in the Middle East highlights the need for NZ to be able to support agriculture / horticulture as it becomes more prohibitive to import food and export our produce due to oil costs (and ultimately a reducing resource)	I urge Council to reconsider this proposal until comprehensive infrastructure planning—including transport, bridges, parking, and safety measures—is demonstrably in place. Growth should be carefully staged, aligned with infrastructure delivery, and designed to protect Cambridge's unique character and liveability.
234/3	Oppose	Rural Land	Once this land is developed, it will no longer be arable. We face a food crisis here in New Zealand, keeping the land we have locally in which to grow food is future proofing.	The proposed private plan change to Rider Park should be dismissed entirely
240/4	Support in Part	Rural Land	The proposed uplift of rural land to residential zoning is a primary concern. While acknowledging housing demand, this raises broader issues relating to loss of productive rural land, precedent-setting for future rezoning, alignment with strategic growth planning	Provide stronger justification for this uplift and demonstrate alignment with long term land use strategy and growth sequencing.
241/9	Oppose	Rural Land	Other wider factors that militate against the proposal include the loss of valuable agricultural / horticultural / equine land that, once lost can never be replaced.	That the proposed plan change be rejected
248/1	Oppose	Rural Land	Loss of rural character and productive land. High value rural land will be lost and undermine the districts strategic goal of protecting versatile soils and maintaining rural landscapes.	Decline this development. It is not in Cambridges best interests.
253/5	Oppose	Rural Land	Want to better understand whether the proposed rezoning appropriately recognises the long-term environmental, cultural and intergenerational impacts of converting rural land to urban use. The Cambridge Community Board notes that land identified for development under PC37 includes currently rural and productive land. The Board is concerned that once land is rezoned and developed for urban purposes, the opportunity for future productive use, ecological restoration or other uses is permanently removed. While recognising the need to provide for housing, the Board considers it important that decisions to rezone rural land are based on a clear understanding of long-term trade-offs, including environmental, cultural and community impacts. Particularly interested in understanding: • Whether there is a clear biodiversity enhancement strategy, rather than reliance on minimum compliance • How green spaces within the development contribute to wider environmental outcomes, not just on-site amenity. How opportunities for land to be restored to natural or ecological functions have been considered alongside development outcomes.	That clarity be provided on how PC37: • Enhances, rather than simply mitigates, biodiversity outcomes. • Protects and strengthens green corridors, ecological connections and open space networks. Responds to climate change and supports long-term environmental resilience.
253/6	Oppose	Rural Land	The proposed rezoning of highly productive rural land raises fundamental questions of intergenerational equity, food production and long-term economic resilience. Highly productive soils are a finite resource. Once land is rezoned and developed for urban purposes, the opportunity for future food production, ecological restoration or alternative rural use is permanently removed. Decisions to rezone highly productive land should only be made where there is a clear and compelling justification, including evidence that reasonable alternatives have been thoroughly considered. Much of the land subject to PC37 lies within an area recognised locally as some of the district's most productive farming land, while significant areas of the district contain soils of markedly lower productive capacity. The Board is not satisfied that PC37, as proposed, has demonstrated that the loss of highly productive land is necessary at this stage, or alternative growth options have been sufficiently explored and exhausted. Land use change of this nature is irreversible, and therefore warrants a precautionary and evidence-led approach.	That clarity be provided on whether the following questions have been addressed: • Does the proposed development enhance Cambridge a better town, rather than simply a larger one? Can housing demand be more appropriately met within the existing town boundary, through intensification or redevelopment?
256/4	Oppose	Rural Land	There is absolutely no need to rezone high quality rural land	Reject this plan change to ensure that Cambridge does not end up with a hollow core, and urban sprawl.
257/4	Oppose	Rural Land	The potential loss of highly productive land associated with the rezoning of the rural zoned land is a concern. Our understanding of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land is that it focuses on the ability of land to support primary production over the long term. In this case, we are concerned that the rural land being rezoned appears to have the characteristics of productive land, and that rezoning it would permanently remove its ability to be used for primary production. The proposal appears to be in direct conflict to the NPSHPL.	Decline

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
262/5	Oppose	Rural Land	PPC37 will result in the irreversible loss of highly productive land and is inconsistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 (NPS-HPL). We believe the NPS-HPL tests are not satisfied by the proposal and that the loss of finite highly productive land from the Rural part of the plan change area should be avoided.	We seek that Proposed Private Plan Change 37 be declined in full. In the alternative, if the Hearing Panel is not minded to decline the plan change entirely, we seek the following relief: That all Rural zoned land outside the Deferred Residential framework in the District Plan be excluded from the rezoning.
263/3	Oppose	Rural Land	Use of fertile land for housing development is short sighted	To not approve this Plan change
269/1	Oppose	Rural Land	Housing subdivisions emissions are at least 2 times, but up to 10 times that of the current rural uses. Therefore the report does not reduce emissions. The emissions from the report, 37.5t, also don't include any emissions from roads, kerbs, wastewater pipes, power installations. All concrete/ petroleum based which easily send the emissions north further still. Housing over rural land does not meet the councils aims of being environmental champions.	To oppose PC37
269/2	Oppose	Rural Land	Productive horticulture like kiwifruit is profitable on blocks as small as 3ha. Berry farms in the district are on smaller blocks still. Suggesting that HPL is fragmented is a white lie. Races, tracks, and amenity buildings are all part of intensively farmed highly productive land. They can easily be removed and land reinstated. Unlike soil that has been concreted over by houses. The land doesn't necessarily need to be amalgamated as per my other points. Highly productive land always has neighbours and cannot be downgraded because it is next to a future town boundary. If this was the case, this sort of land will always be lost for this very (weak) reason. The onus must be on the town to help deal with the effects with the use of neighbouring rural land not always the other way around. Town doesn't have the 'right' over rural. The area marked in red on the applicants NPS coloured map is categorised as not highly productive soil. All the river edge similar topography cleared areas, from Leamington to Arapuni dam, are currently used in intensive pastoral agriculture or equine. I personally lease farmed 30ha on the WDC riverbank greenbelt between Cambridge Park and Marloe Drive, for 20 years. This is the same soil type. We ran dairy winter grazing and the soil was better than our highly productive land at our dairy farm. Some areas in the applicants report are demarcated 'modified' soils. Therefore concluded to be not highly productive. No effort by the author has been put into the report about the possibility of remediating the topsoil. Only in the last two years, a few kilometres down the same road, significant earthworks were undertaken to improve the quality of the farmland, in which its state can now be observed to excellent productive land.	To oppose PC37
270/1	Oppose	Rural Land	There is an expectation that Councils, when processing a private plan change that involves converting rural zoned land to residential, that the Council, will adopt a no-frills approach and only target what is necessary to manage and resolve any issues occurring in the district and to meet their responsibilities under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). There are other Development areas secured for growth up to 2035 that have not been developed. Rezoning this land is out of sequence with the Council's projected growth cell projections. Federated Farmers does not support rezoning of rural land to Medium Density Residential and indicative local purpose reserve.	Not specified
274/1	Oppose	Rural Land	We consider that the assessments provided in the plan change request do not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that Clause 3.6 is met; particularly Clauses 3.6(1)(a), 3.6(1)(b) and 3.6(5). Additionally, the WRPS seeks to avoid a decline in the availability of high class soils for primary production due to inappropriate subdivision, use or development (LF-O5, LF-P11). Method LF-M41 directs that district plans shall give priority to productive uses of high class soils including, among other actions, through restricting urban development on these soils.	Provide a more robust assessment to demonstrate whether the proposed plan change gives effect to Clause 3.6 of the NPS-HPL.
274/2	Oppose	Rural Land	Section 5 of the Soils Assessment discusses the transitional definition of 'highly productive land' prior to the mapping of highly productive land being undertaken by regional councils under the NPS-HPL. This states that "LUC 1, 2, or 3 land is defined by reference to the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory or by any more detailed mapping that uses the Land Use Capability classification".	Clarify that the entirety of the Rural Zone portion of the plan change site meets the transitional definition of highly productive land under the NPS-HPL and ensure the relevant assessments reflect this.

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			This statement is not correct for the purpose of the NPS-HPL assessment, as the transitional definition of highly productive land in Clause 3.5(7) of the NPS-HPL refers to land that is zoned general rural or rural production at the commencement date and is LUC 1, 2 or 3 but does not meet any of the exemptions in Clause 3.5(7)(b). The NPS-HPL does not provide the ability to provide a site-specific assessment for the purpose of demonstrating whether land meets the transitional definition under Clause 3.5(7). As identified in Section 6 of the Soils Assessment, based on the NZLRI map information at the commencement date of the NPS-HPL, the site comprises LUC2 and LUC3 soils. Therefore, under Clause 3.5(7) the entirety of the Rural Zone portion of the site meets the transitional definition of highly productive land.	
274/3	Oppose in Part	Rural Land	We query the classification and interpretation of the 'non-productive/modified soil' areas identified for the site in the Soils Assessment. The legends of some of the maps provided in the report (e.g. Figure 6) indicate that these areas contain "disturbed soil and fill, excavated drains and spill, track, buildings, large windbreaks, and buildings and curtilage". The later text in the comments section of the report appears to indicate that the inclusion of linear 'modified' features such as farm tracks or large windbreaks are being used to help argue that otherwise contiguous areas of highly productive land (e.g. LUC 2s1) are fragmented, not easily used for intensive primary production, and (as a result) have reduced productive potential. We consider that using features such as farm tracks and windbreaks to help imply fragmentation of highly productive land and thus a blanket reduction in productive potential is an overstretch in interpretation.	Amend the NPS-HPL assessment to reflect that the linear modified features such as farm tracks and large windbreaks on the site do not create a blanket reduction in productive potential.
274/4	Oppose	Rural Land	We consider the Economic Assessment does not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the proposed urban rezoning of the Rural Zone portion of the site is required to provide sufficient development capacity to meet demand for housing or business land to give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020, or that the 'live zoning' of the C5 Growth Cell needs to be brought forward from the planned post-2035 timing. This assessment is required to demonstrate that the proposed plan change gives effect to Clause 3.6(1)(a) of the NPS-HPL and Method UFD-M49 and APP13 Criteria A of Proposed WRPS Change 1 – Decisions version.	That a more detailed and robust economic assessment of PPC37 be undertaken, in order to demonstrate whether or not the proposed plan change gives effect to Clause 3.6 of the NPS-HPL and the relevant provisions of the WRPS and Proposed WRPS Change 1 – Decisions version.

Infrastructure and Sequencing

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
2/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	There is a lack of infrastructure across the entire Leamington area. If this project moves forward, the already overcrowded Leamington primary school will struggle to accommodate the influx of new students. Without a third bridge, Leamington will experience severe traffic congestion, relying on just one main route across the existing bridge. Leamington lacks sufficient amenities such as green spaces and playgrounds, doctors' offices, supermarkets, and adequate transport options.	Opposed the change to medium density and keep it as low density residential zone as per previous plan into addition urgent upgrades to keep infrastructure in Leamington.
3/1	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	A third bridge & roading infrastructure prior to subdivision commencement	A third bridge & roading infrastructure prior to subdivision commencement
5/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Inadequate infrastructure and amenities (e.g. schooling) in place to support a medium density residential zone of this size in this location.	To decline this proposal and maintain the zoning as deferred residential until existing issues associated with population growth are addressed.
5/3	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	There is already a large area of residential development underway in the Cambridge Road/Lamb Street subdivision and the issues associated with a dramatic rapid increase in population growth have yet to be addressed.	To decline this proposal and maintain the zoning as deferred residential until existing issues associated with population growth are addressed.
7/1	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The current proposal appears to allow for residential development to proceed ahead of essential services and infrastructure. Without appropriate planning and delivery of key facilities such as a new school, adequate bridge access (a NEW one), and local supermarket/retail options may place significant strain on existing networks and reduce overall liveability for residents. Growth should be well-managed and supported to ensure sustainable outcomes for both new and existing communities.	• Require the provision of key infrastructure (including a new school, additional bridge access, and local retail amenities such as a supermarket) to be planned and delivered prior to, or in parallel with, the subdivision development. • Implement staging conditions to ensure that residential growth does not outpace infrastructure capacity. • Ensure transport networks are upgraded to safely and efficiently accommodate increased traffic volumes.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
				Consider the long-term sustainability and liveability of the area when approving the plan change
8/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I am very opposed to this. Not enough schools as it is.	• That council do not rezone this land.
9/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Changing the land into medium density housing at this time when we do not have infrastructure to support it. We do not have a third bridge, we do not have another high school or middle school. Therefore I do not support 1200 sections opening up without this infrastructure. I don't believe Cambridge needs to keep expanding. But if we must keep growing, then transport links and schooling need to support the growth.	Still zoned rural until a later date.
10/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	That more houses are going to be built and Cambridge does not have the infrastructure to support this. The middle and high school are both getting to capacity as well as the town primary schools, there is not enough parking in town now, the traffic through town and over the bridges is difficult now and yet with all these issues not being addressed the council wants to allow more families to move here and housing to be built. Leamington needs at least a middle school if not a high school and possibly a second primary school	I want to see these issues fixed before the go ahead on yet another housing development.
11/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I do not support this proposed development. To have a further 1250 new homes is great in theory but the town cannot support such development at this time. Our roads, water, sewage, health services are not here to provide that increase in population. Where will these kids go to school? Doctors are already at limit for enrolment. We cannot keep adding houses and squashing people in and not have the basic infrastructure in place. Cambridge is not ready for more large scale developments, parking infrastructure is already stretched.	Please do not proceed with this proposal.
12/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Deny applicants submission due to increased pressure on current town roading infrastructure	Deny the application until a new bridge or north bound interchange is added
14/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Too many new houses are being built without the infrastructure in place. We need new schools and doctors first before we can have that many more people moving to Cambridge. Everything is getting congested as it is. So many more people moving here would make the problem even worse.	Deny the application
16/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge and specifically Leamington would first need better roading and infrastructure to deal with an additional 1250 homes. Forward planning for extra services (e.g. schooling, medical and emergency) and clear communication for current residents on planning for this.	Plans available for current residents to see about the above issues before decisions made. In particular a new bridge to relieve pressure at the already congested current bridge. Also access to SH1 north from the Leamington side of Cambridge would help relieve this pressure.
20/1	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I think it's great to look at this but it will mean more families. For this to happen we need another college. Cambridge is huge now you can't keep bringing more people in and not grow the schools , the primaries are already struggling	How is the Council going to support the new housing with enough schools.
23/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The already over stretched and poor infrastructure of Leamington cannot take more housing. • There is already a need for a third bridge and or an off ramp for the motor way for Leamington (ie: by the golf course). • Where would the children be educated? The local schools are stretched. • Our small town is losing its lively feel with overcrowded developments. • The town centre is backlogged with poor parking and too much traffic. • Medical centres are not coping. • There is not even enough supermarkets to cope with the population now. This would be a disaster for Cambridge. All this development is just greed. Outside the current plan zones no new housing zones should be considered without a massive infrastructure overhaul, for the long term taken from an environmental perspective not a financial one in regards to new development.	Outside the current plan zones no new housing zones should be considered without a massive infrastructure overhaul, for the long term taken from an environmental perspective not a financial one in regards to new development. To oppose this change and stop this going ahead.
24/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I support the intent of providing more housing but OPPOSE the plan change in its current form. While I recognise the need for additional housing in the Waipā District, the scale and speed of this development are premature given the current infrastructure deficit in Cambridge and Leamington. It is irresponsible to approve a development that could bring 3,000 new residents (including hundreds of school-aged children) without a guaranteed commitment that educational facilities will be built to meet this specific demand. Existing GP practices in Cambridge are frequently closed to new enrolments or have weeks-long wait times for non-urgent appointments.	Decline Private Plan Change 37 in its entirety until such time as a third bridge location is confirmed and the Cambridge West school project is reinstated. OR, in the alternative: • Approve the plan change only with strict staging conditions that prevent the release of titles until specific infrastructure milestones (Bridge and School) are under construction. • Ensure that any commercial zoning within PC37 specifically incentivises or provides for a large-scale, low-cost grocery provider.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			Adding 1,250 households (approx. 3,000 people) without a mandated, developer-funded contribution toward a 24/7 urgent care facility—or a commitment from Health New Zealand to increase local capacity—is a direct threat to the health and safety of both new and existing Cambridge residents.	Requirement that the developer provides a "Health Impact Assessment" and demonstrates how the medical needs of these 3,000 additional residents will be met without further straining the already over-capacity local GP clinics.
24/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The rapid growth rate of Cambridge (currently projected to reach 34,000 by 2055) has outpaced the provision of central car parking and roading upgrades. Without a concurrent "Infrastructure First" approach, this development will degrade the liveability of the existing town for current residents.	Not Specified
25/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I oppose any further opportunity for additional housing to be added to Cambridge until such time as the infrastructure to support it has been installed such that the amenity to housing occupants is restored to 2000 levels and infrastructure to support this development is installed in advance so as to maintain the 2000 levels. By 2000 levels I mean for example that parking per head of population, across town / through town / around town, including transiting the Waikato River, transit times, and ease is restored to similar to year 2000 levels.	That the plan change 37 not be approved.
27/1	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Growth is always welcomed, however how will this infrastructure cost be structured? This will need big money, and won't be possible for developers to foot alone without making it un-viable. Medical facilities in this town are extremely stretched, as is transport.	Not specified
29/1	Support	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Developers would also need to help fund more infrastructure in the area and potentially think about extra loads in current, childcare, schools, healthcare and local amenities. I'm all for growing Cambridge but it needs more of all these facilities.	Not specified
30/2	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	School provision - the primary school is already at bursting point, Middle School and High school resources needs to be considered. Health accessibility- is there enough primary health availability? Its already stretched with wait times for appointments	I would like to know what considerations the council have given to these areas
31/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The large number of new houses proposed to be built, thus increasing the size of the population of Cambridge, which already struggles with insufficient infrastructure, especially insufficient bridges crossing the Waikato River.	That Council approves construction of a third bridge to cross the Waikato River before the construction of new houses on the Leamington side of the river. The Developer should contribute to this cost.
33/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I am against the plan to subdivide the land into a residential development. The reasons are as follows: • Cambridge is already at capacity for being able to cope with the population and traffic. Until infrastructure is in place to cope with more housing (ergo people), then theses large subdivisions need to be kept on hold. • The Middle and Secondary Schools are already at capacity - until a Government commit to a new Middle/High School (ideally on the Leamington side) growth MUST be halted. • There is no road infrastructure to allow for growth - in particular a third bridge! • The issues Cambridge already has are terrible and with no firm plans for a new bridge we are 10-15 years away from getting one. • An on ramp to the Expressway at the Golf course part would ease some traffic through town, but not enough to help with congestion for population growth. • The town just is not able to cope with more growth on the outskirts at all. Council need to have infrastructure sorted prior to more. They must insist the Government commit to new schools before they free up new land for housing.	To decline the proposal to allow the land to be zoned for medium density residential housing at this stage.
34/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	At this current point in time we don't have the infrastructure specifically bridges in order to accommodate the additional traffic that the subdivision will generate.	They put in a new bridge where the subdivision is located
35/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Infrastructure - roading, schooling, supermarkets and medical centres are all at capacity and need to be considered as part of any rezoning.	Decline application or put the money into all of the above. And a third bridge
36/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The infrastructure of town is already maxed out. Schools overloaded, roads gridlocked at peak times, bridges under huge stress with no 3rd on the table. Its crazy to consider this proposal	Fix the infrastructure to cope with the growth already happening. Its unfair for us to be paying mega rates/ water etc already
37/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge is not planned for the size that it has gotten to currently (2026-march). Placement of roading, bridges, car parks are suitable to a low population and this proposed plan could make things even more uncomfortable in Cambridge. The pedestrian crossings in town clog up the roads because of the number of people walking around and the number of cars using the Main Street. The lovely thing about Cambridge is its small town feel and having too many more houses built will ruin this. Is our town plumbing even suited to having this many more people? And what about the rubbish collection system? And the number of police in town?	Leave land as it is

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
38/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	This is a small town and the infrastructure just cannot handle what we currently have. Adding an additional 10,000 people to the mix will make it 10× worse for everyone with a bigger shortage. As it is: • it is so difficult to get a Dr's appointment due to not enough Dr's and too many patients. • Our only major supermarket Woolworths often has empty shelves and can't keep up with the current demand. • Our high school isn't big enough and children in the surrounding areas like Matamata, etc have to come to Cambridge high. • There isn't the infrastructure to support our current population let alone if we grew! • The congestion in town is ridiculous, especially the high level bridge and you have to wait for ages to cross. • There is never any parking in town and with more people this will only get worse. Our primary schools are full and bursting at the seams.	To reconsider the towns infrastructure and think critically about whether Cambridge can sustain such a large amount of new housing. Considering it takes time to build up infrastructure, you can't expect people to live with shortages for years on end
40/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Another bridge should be built before there is more building of houses in Leamington, and the ability to bypass the main town of Cambridge so it doesn't get so congested.	The building of 1250 houses to be put on hold until a bridge is built.
41/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I am opposed due to lack of infrastructure	Refuse rezoning
42/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The area does not have the infrastructure. The traffic is congested as is, and schools are under pressure. Go build somewhere else!!	Decline this silly plan to build 1250 houses
43/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The Leamington side of town cannot handle any more traffic, the town centre cannot handle the amount of traffic flowing through it, due to there being no on or off ramps. We cannot get appointments at the doctors now let alone another 3000+ people moving to town.	Decline the proposal of another new subdivision in Leamington or Cambridge. Sort the traffic flowing through before any further subdivisions are approved.
44/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Expanding a town outwards does more harm than good. More pressure on infrastructure	Do not rezone this land. Encourage productive use of it
45/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The growth is happening faster than the infrastructure can cope with. We currently have issues in town with water and power supply. Congestion on and off peak times. The current bridges and roading could not manage with an extra 1200 + cars on our roads. The council should put the people before profits of individuals and say no or at least delay this expansion.	This needs to be delayed at least 10 years until adequate expansion of our services and infrastructure is done.
46/1	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I understand the need for growth however things need to be in place prior to all these people building houses and moving in. • There needs to be a 3rd bridge, you can't increase the number of houses in Leamington and expect Cambridge to carry on with a bridge that is not fit for purpose (narrow and in the wrong part of town). • There was a need for at least one new primary school prior to all this and now with the extra growth there is a need for at least a second new primary school and potentially middle school. Having 2 main supermarkets in town are fine for now but there is an increasing need for a supermarket and having it not in the middle of town would be better as to not clog the centre of town. Fresh choice in Leamington is a prime example of this, but there needs to be a larger supermarket somewhere else.	Not specified
47/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I oppose the development due to the added pressure on Cambridge Schools. Leamington really needs it's own College (7-13y)	To prevent the development of Milian Park stud.
48/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Insane we have to spend our time sitting in traffic or trying to find a park more than enjoying our town these days. You have turned a once beautiful town into retirement village & developers playground. Actually insane we have to spend our time sitting in traffic or trying to find a park more than enjoying our town these days.	They really need to hire some good asset managers, strategic planners & community all rounders to get back to the business of getting the basics right.
49/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I believe there needs to be infrastructure improvements made before opening up more land for development. • Roading: We would benefit from better roading connections. • Schooling: Accommodate for the extra students expected to move into the proposed re zoned residential land in question. • Supermarket: The ones we have are always very busy with little parking, if it wasn't for home delivery and pickup services it would have been at breaking point already. More residents mean more mouths to feed.	Clear plans with an order set out on these infrastructure improvements before more housing is approved. • A third bridge is needed asap to deal with the extra residents. • Hamilton bound on and off ramp at the golf course intersection would be beneficial and should have been done from the start, especially if the quarry is going ahead. • The new school that was paused at Bridleways development would be helpful Another supermarket would be useful

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
50/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The area does not need more housing. There is a massive development on Cambridge Road that is not complete. The area infrastructure cannot sustain yet more traffic. There are not enough schools or doctors to support yet more people.	Reject the proposal for more building of houses in the area for some substantial time.
51/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Area is unable to cope with the extra traffic that this will bring in	3rd bridge required before any extra houses built
52/1	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	That the approval is contingent on the provision of zoning for an additional high school within the development. Waipā is in desperate need of another high school and this zoning change is a perfect opportunity and location for ensuring provision of a suitable site.	For the zoning change approval be contingent upon the inclusion of a high school/education site within the development.
54/1	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	High school Leamington side and maybe another primary + middle. This would reduce peak traffic across already stretched crossings. Similar for an additional supermarket. Hugely needing additional medical facility. Public transport or tier bus cambridge Leamington Te Awamutu Ohaupo would be good. Less trucks transiting town in all directions.	Not specified
55/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	There are indicators of a town at full capacity, such as long waits to see a GP, jam-packed supermarkets, and the same number of schools there were thirty years ago. I wonder about the fitness for the town's water and sewage systems to cope with more new homes.	Reject completely Proposed Private Plan Change 37 - Rider Park Structure Plan and rezone the land to Rural.
56/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Infrastructure capacity and timing: Existing infrastructure in Leamington and wider Cambridge is already under pressure, particularly wastewater, stormwater, and roading networks. There is insufficient evidence that infrastructure upgrades will be delivered in advance of, or in alignment with, development, rather than lagging behind it. Premature sequencing of growth: Parts of this land were previously identified for longer-term development. Bringing this forward appears inconsistent with a logical, infrastructure-led growth strategy.	**Primary relief:** Decline Private Plan Change 37 in its current form. **Alternative relief** (if the plan change is approved in some form): • Reduce the scale and staging of development to align with confirmed infrastructure capacity and funding. • Introduce explicit staging provisions that prevent development from proceeding until adequate wastewater, stormwater, and water infrastructure is fully operational. Ensure development sequencing is consistent with long-term growth planning, rather than advancing large-scale development ahead of infrastructure readiness.
57/2	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Supermarkets are overwhelmed already adding a large subdivision will only make it more untenable to shop in Cambridge. Medical centres in Leamington are already full to bursting you can't get an appointment for around 3-4 weeks, where are an extra potential 2-3 thousand people going to go? There is only 1 primary school in Leamington, 1 middle school in Cambridge and 1 public High School (with a very large roll already) where will the influx of children be educated?	That Council ensure: • adequate provision is made for schooling to meet the needs of the growing population, including consideration of school capacity and safe access for students. • sufficient healthcare infrastructure, including access to medical services, is planned and provided to support future residents. • That development staging is aligned with the delivery of key infrastructure, so that growth does not outpace the capacity of roads, schools, and medical services. Alternatively, that the plan change be declined or deferred until these infrastructure and service capacity issues are appropriately addressed.
60/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I submit in opposition to aspects of PC37, particularly as they relate to scale and timing relative to provision of essential infrastructure. There appears to be insufficient coordination between land use and infrastructure planning. There is no clear, funded and time-bound programme ensuring that key infrastructure will be delivered in step with growth. This creates a risk that existing residents will bear the burden of degraded service levels. The proposal does not adequately address the provision of essential community infrastructure like schools (currently near capacity), medical facilities, retail and community amenities.	I request that PC 37 is delayed until infrastructure capability is sufficient. Require binding infrastructure triggers like a third bridge, key road corridors and additional motorway access points, new schools, medical facilities and retail amenities. I urge Council to adopt a more cautious, infrastructure-led approach under PC 37
62/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Primary Schooling: Leamington Primary School lacks the physical capacity to absorb hundreds of new students. Given that the Ministry of Education has recently retracted promises for new schools in the area, there is zero certainty that education needs will be met. Secondary Schooling: Cambridge High School is the only secondary provider and is already operating under a tight enrolment scheme. This development risks "zoning out" existing families or creating unsustainable overcrowding.	Decline the Plan Change in its entirety until a third bridge is funded and the Tirau Road expressway ramp is modified to a bi-directional exchange. Require Developer Contributions: The developer should be responsible for a proportional share of the cost of bringing forward this major infrastructure.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			Integration and Timing (The "Cumulative Effect") This land is currently "Deferred Residential," intended for development after 2035. Accelerating this through a Private Plan Change bypasses the Council's long-term infrastructure sequencing. When added to the existing Bridleways and C2/C3 growth cells, the cumulative effect on Cambridge will be a total failure of the transport network. The financial burden of this growth should not be shifted onto existing ratepayers who are already under significant pressure. The developer should not profit without financially supporting the community infrastructure required to make their project viable.	Staging Requirements: If approved, no titles should be issued until the Ministry of Education provides a binding commitment and construction timeline for additional local primary school capacity.
64/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Leamington does not have the infrastructure to support this population increase. • Traffic getting over the bridge is already insane and doctors/healthcare is stretched - we now have to wait multiple weeks to even get an appointment. • We need a new bridge, another supermarket, more schooling & a 24/7 A&E to support the population. Cambridge's community is so special, we need to protect this.	Oppose the submission until infrastructure is in place and the population increase can be supported. We risk losing all the great people in town and the community otherwise.
65/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge infrastructure needs to come first. The schools are overflowing as it is. We need another middle school for sure. Medical centres are full. Supermarket is always running out of stuff. New homes bring in more population and Cambridge town I do not feel can cope.	Do something about the infrastructure first before making more land into houses.
66/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge is a country town not a small city. No infrastructure to support more houses in Cambridge this includes and not limited to parking, water, roading, schooling, doctors, 3rd bridge, supermarkets.	To make the right decision for the ratepayers and not line your own pockets.
68/1	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Growth in the Deferred Residential zone is appropriate if infrastructure keeps up. My submission is that the Deferred Residential 45.71 is rezoned to Medium Density Residential within the C5 growth cell only if appropriate contributions to improving roading and bridge connectivity to central Cambridge are completed.	That Council: • only support rezoning of the Deferred Residential (45.71ha) within the C5 growth cell where it can be demonstrated that the existing transport network can accommodate growth, or that funded and deliverable upgrades are in place. does not support rezoning of the Rural (52.89) ha within the C5 growth cell.
69/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Prematurity & Infrastructure Deficit: The Waipā 2050 Growth Strategy specifically deferred this land until after 2035. This was to ensure infrastructure (specifically the Leamington bridge and wastewater pipes) could catch up. Approving this now creates an "infrastructure deficit" that the current community will have to live through. Wastewater Capacity: The existing wastewater infrastructure is insufficient to handle the increased load. The plan does not adequately demonstrate how the network will be upgraded to prevent overloads.	I seek that the Council decline Private Plan Change 37 in its current form. Alternatively, I seek the following amendments and conditions: Infrastructure Guarantee: Delay rezoning until a funded plan for wastewater upgrades and 3-waters capacity is fully confirmed and proven to be sufficient.
70/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Traffic congestion, bridge access, strain on the current resources (water), strain on schooling, medical facilities. This proposal changes the whole ethos of a small town most people live here for, which has already been significantly eroded by rapid growth.	To decline this proposal
71/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I oppose this plan, particularly the rural aspect to medium density residential zone. We are creating many medium density residential zones but not providing adequate services (such as waste, water, electricity) or updating the existing services.	I seek the 52.89ha or Rural Zone to remain rural and not be changed to medium density residential zone
72/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Housing increase is detrimental to Cambridge for the following: • Victoria Road has seen an increase in traffic volume since road reorientation from Hamilton Road and Victoria Road changes; • increase in vehicle usage and access difficulties for Clare Street and Victoria Road; • engineering health and safety issues for mass increase on both bridges; • infrastructure pressures are affecting all of us now this will only increase to put a strain on our environment / rates / schooling or lack of it / services such as doctors / dentistry; • water and waste services are an issue which adds to our existing problems. No forethought, understanding or consideration of what matters to our community.	Remove the increase in housing. It's not just about money!
74/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge town does not have adequate utilities and roading to support the new 1000+ houses on the plan change. Outside of roads Cambridge services a large area with only two supermarkets. It doesn't have the facilities to support 1000 new homes without infrastructure development.	The council should not approve the changes to the plan to allow more residential zoning unless additional roading and utilities into Cambridge from the South are made available.
75/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge's infrastructure is already under pressure with the current new subdivisions going up. One more that will add so many houses will stretch it beyond its capacity to support the town as a whole. Will you be upgrading	Not specified

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			and expanding the sewerage systems and treatment, the wastewater systems and treatment, the clean water supply and the will you address the transport issues with a third bridge and/or busses that circle around town. Who will pay for this - the subdividers, council or ratepayers?	
76/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The area is already overloaded with traffic, space in the school and lack of groceries/amenities particularly on that side of the river. Traffic to and from Leamington to the highway over the existing bridges is already an issue; adding more families and commuters will only worsen the situation. Solve the infrastructure problems FIRST, then add the housing. The surrounding area would support the businesses and a growth plan for school/education as the area grows.	Wait to allow more farmland to convert to housing after infrastructure has been designed/put into place before stressing the town even further
77/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Please do not consider this. Our infrastructure is not coping with all the new homes. I have young kids and I am becoming very anxious about the high volume of traffic on our roads and no traffic lights. We have had some near misses, even trying to go to school. Add in all these homes and no third bridge is a disaster waiting to happen. We already can't afford the rates and can't afford any more until this development brings a return. Please don't overpopulate this already overpopulated town.	To oppose
80/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	We already have a problem with infrastructure in Cambridge. We need another bridge, new schools, and medical centres. People come here because they want to live in a small town. We don't want to become a little city with even poorer infrastructure.	Please look at new infrastructure before opening up more land for housing or stop the plan altogether.
82/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I am concerned about the impact on the current water infrastructure. My understanding is that our current water infrastructure is in need of upgrading and and that it is being transferred to the Council Controlled Organisation Waikato Waters Limited. • I am concerned that added pressure on the current system would significantly compound the issues we are already facing. • What would the increase in demand be by that many houses? • How would that impact affect the current supply of water and the infrastructure delivering the water? • Could any future development included onsite treatment and collection of sewage and stormwater? Other concerns include: • where will the added residents shop for groceries? Are they all going to go to the main supermarkets in Cambridge and so again adding extra pressure to the roading or will the developer be required to include and develop commercial sites to service the needs of these potential residents? • Where will they access medical care? Many of our current GP's are only taking on limited numbers of new patients and even once you are registered the wait for an appointment is fairly lengthy. • Does this proposed new subdivision include plans for a medical centre? • Where will the children go to school? Has Leamington School got the capacity to cope with this roll growth for the younger children and what about the secondary school age students, are they all going to attend Cambridge High School. Getting to Cambridge High School from Leamington is already a slow and congested process? Will buses be supplied? What about impact resulting from the increased demand on the electricity supply. Should each home be required to have solar panels?	I would like the council to decline this current request until robust, evidence based information is sought by the current landowner and communicated to the current ratepayers for a second round of submissions if the landowner wishes to resubmit at that point We need to be thinking long-term. • Let's fix our ageing infrastructure first and then add more housing. • Let's plan housing developments including the impact of the changing climate and other factors like limiting housing being in places which require cars to be used to access everyday services like groceries, schools and medical care. • Let's plan for local community done sustainably and thoughtfully.
83/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge is not currently not equipped to cope with an influx of this number. Not enough schools, doctors, our roads	Put this on a long term hold
84/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Infrastructure, roading, river crossings, school rolls and medical facilities are already stretched.	To oppose the request for rezoning
86/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Lack of suitable infrastructure including water, wastewater and sewage, roading, parking, schooling to currently support a development of this size. Currently I am on a 3300 section with 4 people and must provide my own septic tank yet this development can put 8 houses on the same size with approx 20 to 30 and the council will provide septic? Roading and access to Browning Streets .	Opposing this submission until we have clarity from the council around new schools to support this growth .
88/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	A development of this scale would place considerable pressure on existing Cambridge infrastructure, including roads, water supply, wastewater, stormwater systems, schools, healthcare services, and other community facilities.	That Waipā District Council declines Private Plan Change 37 as notified. Alternatively, if Council is minded to approve the plan change, I seek that it be deferred or substantially amended to include clear, binding requirements that all necessary supporting infrastructure upgrades (including transport,

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			At present, this infrastructure is already under strain, and there is insufficient evidence that it can support this level of growth without major upgrades being delivered in advance. Approving such a large development before critical infrastructure improvements are in place would negatively affect the quality of life for current residents and would represent poor long-term planning outcomes for Cambridge.	water, wastewater, stormwater, and community facilities) are completed before additional residential capacity is enabled on the site. Without these requirements, the plan change should not proceed.
89/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I am fully against. Cambridge has expanded enough as it is and the infrastructure can barely keep up. There are not enough Doctors. Schools or bridges. The PC37 encroaches too much on the greenbelt and also the Leamington Cemetery where I have just laid my Mother to rest.	I would like to see it left in statute as farmland
90/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I am against this plan change because the Waipā council does not have the infrastructure to support this project.	The council should halt all subdivisions until we have the infrastructure in place. Infrastructure – roads utilities hospitals schools, which at the moment there are no plans for
91/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Inconsistency with Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Timing. The land within the proposed Rider Park Structure Plan includes approximately 45.71 hectares of "Deferred Residential" land. According to the Waipa District Plan, this land was designated for growth beyond 2035. By seeking to rezone this for immediate Medium Density Residential (MDR) development, the applicant is "leapfrogging" the Council's own managed growth strategy. This creates a significant "out-of-sequence" infrastructure burden. The Council's Long Term Plan (LTP) has not budgeted for the accelerated upgrades to water, wastewater, and roading required by a development of this scale (approx. 1,250 dwellings). Such a massive influx of residents a decade ahead of schedule risks over-burdening existing systems and shifting the financial cost of developer-led infrastructure onto the current ratepayer base.	I seek that the Waipa District Council decline Private Plan Change 37 in its entirety. If the Council is minded to approve any part of the plan, I seek that the density be significantly reduced to Low Density Residential (matching the existing Leamington character) and that all development be delayed until the scheduled 2035 timeframe to allow for proper infrastructure integration.
93/1	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The development is for 1250 houses where transport for them predominantly needs access to Shakespeare Street. This would be a right hand turn from either Wordsworth Street or Kingsley Street for those wishing to take a short cut. The Intersection from Wordsworth St to Shakespeare Street would be best served with traffic lights. The intersection from Kingsley St to Shakespeare St would be best served with a roundabout. The reasons for this view is that Shakespeare St is the only major through road for this developments traffic, requiring a right hand turn in most instances. Current residents of this Leamington East area struggle for a right hand turn into Shakespeare Street. Traffic from an additional 1250 houses would dramatically make access to Shakespeare Street a burden for all households in this area of Leamington.	I would like: • traffic lights put in at the intersection of Wordsworth Street and Shakespeare Street. • a roundabout put in at the intersection of Kingsley Street and Shakespeare Street. The cost of this would be paid for by the developer.
94/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	You need to sort your long-term town planning, parking, traffic congestion, roading infrastructure including additional bridges etc and retail spaces before you look to bring another 2,500-3,000 cars (assume 2 cars per household) and a subdivision to the town.	To not allow this to go ahead
95/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Environmental issues that cause more pressure on local infrastructures and natural resources. • Increased population density causing more waste and high demands for water, energy and sanitation systems. • Stormwater drains run off causing debris maybe chemicals into the river causing contamination. • Schooling we have one primary school in Leamington, one middle school and high school. How many more class rooms can you continue to build. I feel that Council are doing the tick box on asking our views but it will be already decided .	Do not build on the land. How many more estates can we have in Cambridge
96/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Without the necessary increase into the surrounding transport links, it will lead to more congestion and over run of local facilities. The town is not able to handle such a large increase in amount of vehicles and people. The schools and transport links won't be able to handle the extra pressure.	Decline the rezoning of the 98.6 hectares of land to Medium Density
97/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	WDC is already in serious debt with much of rates income already being used to service debt interest. There are already many vacant sections for sale. Unless the development is fully financed by the developer WDC (ratepayers) will be liable for providing the necessary infrastructure.	Permission for the proposed subdivision be declined

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			This is especially concerning as existing facilities are already under pressure. Given the current financial situation of both WDC and the ratepayers, additional expenditure for another development is unacceptable, especially given the long timeframe for costs recovery via development fees.	
98/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	PC37, as currently proposed, places growth ahead of infrastructure, assumptions ahead of certainty, and community risk ahead of developer responsibility. Without fundamental changes, the proposal undermines sound resource management, equitable infrastructure funding, and long term urban resilience for Leamington, Cambridge, and the wider Waipā District. All infrastructure required to mitigate the effects of PC37 must be fully funded by the landowner and developer, delivered in advance of, or concurrently with, development, secured through enforceable planning provisions, not reliance on future agreements. Development contributions and high level assurances are not sufficient for a proposal of this scale and complexity.	I seek that Waipā District Council Decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37; or In the alternative, substantially amend the plan change to require: • Explicit provision for additional Waikato River bridge capacity • Binding infrastructure delivery and funding conditions • Demonstrated integration with regional transport networks • Clear assurance that no infrastructure costs fall to Council or ratepayers Defer consideration until comprehensive, independently verified infrastructure and transport solutions are in place and fully funded by the developer
98/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The proposal brings forward development that was previously identified for later release, without adequate demonstration that: earlier growth areas are fully serviced and delivered, the cumulative effects of concurrent developments are manageable, network resilience is maintained. Approving this plan change prematurely risks fragmented growth, reactive infrastructure investment, and long term inefficiency.	I seek that Waipā District Council Decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37; or In the alternative, substantially amend the plan change to require: • Explicit provision for additional Waikato River bridge capacity • Binding infrastructure delivery and funding conditions • Demonstrated integration with regional transport networks • Clear assurance that no infrastructure costs fall to Council or ratepayers Defer consideration until comprehensive, independently verified infrastructure and transport solutions are in place and fully funded by the developer
99/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Without realistic alternatives to private vehicle use, the proposal will increase car dependency, placing additional pressure on already constrained roads and undermining climate and safety objectives.	Not specified
99/3	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The lack of enforceable certainty within the plan change itself that all infrastructure upgrades required to mitigate adverse effects will be fully paid for by the landowner and developer, rather than deferred to Council or ratepayers. Critically, the plan change does not provide sufficient certainty that all infrastructure costs will be fully borne by the landowner and developer. Good planning requires that growth is enabled only when infrastructure is in place, not promised.	Ensure that no infrastructure costs, safety risks, or transport inefficiencies are transferred to existing residents, families, or ratepayers.
100/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	At present the community is struggling to cope with the growth that we have had and will need to time to put in place new transport options, including a bridge to cope with the current population and ordinary growth of the town. Although a subdivision like this may be okay in the future, we need time to get our infrastructure in place before we allow a development of this size to go ahead.	Decline the application.
101/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	There should be not further residential development consented in the greater Cambridge area until all infrastructure issues are resolved. This would importantly include traffic impact on the town centre and the provision of a third bridge.	There is to be no further residential development consented until Cambridge has a third bridge and a bypass system to avoid congestion in the main street.
102/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Where is the extra water for all these dwellings coming from? Every year we have water restrictions during summer months without the addition of all these extra new houses plus all the new houses consented but not yet built yet.	That unless the council can satisfy us that extra water is available and we will no longer have summer restrictions then this consent must be withheld.
105/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Leamington is such a nice family friendly town, already traffic gets badly congested, infrastructure will suffer greatly with the added housing, supermarkets, small businesses, fuel station etc will struggle to keep up the demand of an extra 1250 homes. Many people have decided to make Cambridge and Leamington their retirement town as it's not overpopulated, it's a very beautiful clean and respectful place. This seems more like the developer trying to line their pockets than what's best for the town and the people that reside there. 1250 homes with a potential 2500+ more vehicles in the area doesn't seem to sound right or benefit anyone except the developer and the Councils rates account.	Proof that Leamington and Cambridge infrastructure can handle an increased population as proposed also what is the likelihood that current homes including the new pukekura estate and existing homes will not suffer from devaluation given the new population numbers.
107/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	This rezoning leading to many additional homes in the Leamington area will put a strain on the present infrastructure and create extra transport volume and noise travelling through Leamington.	Rezoning 45 hectares of the C5 growth cell from deferred residential zone to medium density residential zone is declined. No additions to and/or amendment of provisions within sections 2A, 15 and 21. No inserting a new

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			The people presently living in Leamington which has a shopping hub on Shakespeare Street should be able to enjoy the shopping village without having to deal with the addition of extra cars and noise on the road as a result of the new subdivision. The rezoning with the extra houses will impact on the infrastructure and services provided to Leamington. Waipā ratepayers should not have to pay for additional infrastructure and services to support a subdivision that is not needed for Cambridge. Waipā ratepayer money would be better spent on building a new Library. There are already a number of new subdivisions in other areas in Cambridge allowing for growth, this subdivision with its impact on Leamington is not needed.	appendix for the Rider Park Structure Plan into the Waipā District plan. No amending of the planning maps.
108/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge as a whole has more than enough land already available for the building of homes, in Cambridge West (Bridleways, Abergeldie Way and the St Peters developments), the Te Awa project (north of Lamb Street/east of Cambridge Road).	That the proposal in its entirety, be denied and that the status quo remains.
108/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The vast majority looking to reside in the proposed Rider Park development will be working north of the Waikato River (in the Cambridge CBD or the Hautapu industrial area) or in Hamilton City. The current bridge infrastructure is woefully inadequate for the existing residents needing access across the river. While having two bridges is not a single point of failure, the Victoria Bridge is not reliable and significant issues arise when it is not available. Other public infrastructure (water, sewerage, stormwater) will also be stressed - who will pay to have that beefed up as necessary? More cost to the already stretched existing ratepayers. The money required for this would be much better spent on other facilities within the town, e.g. the Public Library, a third bridge, etc. The same applies to other infrastructure (power, communications, etc) - who pays to have that beefed up? Schools will also need to be expanded to handle the extra students - all the existing schools in the Cambridge area are land constrained with no room for the extra buildings and facilities required for the needs of the schools with their expanded rolls.	That the proposal in its entirety, be denied and that the status quo remains.
109/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Against the plan change as I accept with time it is a logical and sensible place for expansion of the town to take place, my issue is as Cambridge is so rapidly expanding we are already seeing massive overload of infrastructure, we really need to be having the capacity for expansion in place before we approve large changes such as this. I appreciate it bounds the green belt but there appears to be minimal parks other than the current cemetery valley creek	Delay the approval until such a time as new schools, roading, another river crossing are in place/ have been funded by the developer.
110/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Waipā Council has failed to consider the impact to the town and community. The lack of strategic infrastructure means this development will put considerable impacts on existing infrastructure. The road network, school rolls, primary healthcare services etc. Council needs to reject any further development	Reject this proposed development and all subsequent until substantial infrastructure investment occurs. Stop wasting money on petty projects (parks) and think big solutions to infrastructure.
111/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge is already overflowing and at capacity with new houses. We already have significant issues with traffic within the town and wider area. We do not have a plan for a third bridge. Schools and primary care facilities are at maximum capacity.	Reject the development and any further housing developments until a plan is in place to increase infrastructure and a third bridge is built.
112/1	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Why do we need to rezone C5 now and not in 2035 • Are the currently prioritised growth zones Cambridge North, C1, C2, C3, C4 and C6 insufficient to cater to population growth until 2035? • Especially in light of the Waipa 2050 Growth Strategy specifying the need to focus on areas north of the river, due to better connectivity to public amenities and Hamilton. The P37 documentation outlines the need for additional housing, due to increased growth (based of economic modelling from 2022, which is nearly 4 years old), but doesn't address if there is any ability to increase the housing capacity in current growth zones. And if the collective agreement is that we need to prioritise the development in the South East of Cambridge, what Waipa infrastructure projects (water, public transport, roading, etc.) will be prioritised to handle a significant increase in residents in this area?	An explanation as to why an increase in housing density as proposed in PC37 cannot be considered for current growth cells (Cambridge North, C1, C2, C3, C4 and C6), allowing C5 to be deferred until 2035. A clear outline of the Waipa District projects that will be prioritised to ensure the C5 area will indeed become a development that has good accessibility - by way of public or active transport for the estimated 3,000+ people living there between their housing and jobs, community services, natural/open spaces.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
112/2	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Why change the C5 zone boundaries? • Why is the south/southwestern part of the current C5 deferred zone no longer suitable for inclusion? • And what makes the newly added area – in particular the area north/northeast, adjacent to the green belt, reserve, Pā site and Waikato river – more suitable? Both from a geological, as well as cultural and ecological point of view. Is the wider Waipa community really served better by rezoning an area of (some) cultural and ecological significance into a Medium Density Residential Zone? Why not expand this zone further east instead of north as indicated with purple on the image attached?	A reconsideration of the plan change of the 52ha north/east of the C5 growth cell. Don't extend the zone all the way to the river, but consider sections of land to the east of the proposed zone (highlighted in purple on the map attached).
113/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The existing infrastructure network serving the Rider Park Structure Plan area and the surrounding community is already operating under significant strain. Approving medium-density rezoning at this time would impose a substantially increased demand on infrastructure systems that are not currently capable of supporting it. These infrastructure gaps represent a fundamental constraint on the appropriateness of upzoning the Rider Park area at this time. The Council has a responsibility to ensure that growth is accompanied by the infrastructure necessary to sustain it, and to prioritise resolving existing community deficits before enabling further intensification.	Decline the proposed plan change to rezone the Rider Park Structure Plan area to medium density residential in its current form; OR • Defer any decision on the rezoning until a comprehensive infrastructure capacity assessment has been completed, published, and consulted upon; and • Commission an independent traffic impact assessment of the proposed rezoning, with findings made publicly available prior to any decision being made; and Commit to a published infrastructure investment plan that prioritises addressing existing deficiencies before enabling further residential intensification in the area.
113/3	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Council should prioritise resolving existing infrastructure shortfalls throughout the community before permitting further growth that will compound these problems. Enabling medium-density development before addressing foundational infrastructure gaps risks locking in long-term problems that will be considerably more costly to remediate in the future. Growth must be planned and sequenced in a manner that is equitable to existing residents, who are already experiencing the adverse effects of infrastructure under investment. The proposed plan change, in its current form, does not demonstrate that this obligation has been met.	Decline the proposed plan change to rezone the Rider Park Structure Plan area to medium density residential in its current form; OR • Defer any decision on the rezoning until a comprehensive infrastructure capacity assessment has been completed, published, and consulted upon; and • Commission an independent traffic impact assessment of the proposed rezoning, with findings made publicly available prior to any decision being made; and Commit to a published infrastructure investment plan that prioritises addressing existing deficiencies before enabling further residential intensification in the area.
114/1	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	That the rezoning not occur until there is a clear plan to put the necessary infrastructure in place before the new population arrives. How are residents of this new area going to connect to the rest of Cambridge? Using the single connector that is Browning Street/Shakespeare Street that is already under pressure and the same two bridges as everyone else?	Do not allow this rezoning until the third Waikato river crossing bridge has a consented plan for construction.
117/1	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The ageing and limited capacity of bridge infrastructure, combined with the lack of schools and essential services on the Leamington side of town, is already constraining reliable and resilient transport links between Cambridge and Leamington. These conditions exist before a single additional dwelling from this plan change is occupied. The plan change would make an existing problem significantly worse If approved, approximately 1,250 new homes would be built on the edge of town. At a conservative average of 1.5 vehicle trips per household per peak hour, this represents in the order of 1,800 additional vehicle movements per peak period. The existing crossings cannot	I ask the Council to decline Private Plan Change 37 as notified, or alternatively, to impose conditions that make any rezoning and subsequent development approvals contingent on a confirmed and funded river crossing solution being in place prior to titles being issued.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			absorb this demand. Rezoning land ahead of any committed solution to this constraint does not resolve the problem; it locks it in. The third crossing is not resolved. Approving this plan change in advance of any resolution to the crossing question is contrary to sound planning practice. Infrastructure sequencing is a fundamental requirement of responsible growth management.	
118/2	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	All homes to be self-sufficient (e.g. own water and Sewerage and solar power) as Cambridge already has issues supplying existing properties without putting more pressure on services.	The developer to address these issues.
120/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	This property is the logical choice for the E-W bypass and 3rd bridge. Development on this side of the river will aggravate the traffic problems.	To forbid development of this site until the Cambridge Connections project decides on the route of the bypass and 3rd bridge.
121/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Off-ramp and on-ramp into and out of Leamington by golf course needs immediate addressing before this change, to avoid Cambridge congestion. The third bridge would not reduce traffic in this instance!	New on-ramp and off-ramp at southern end for Leamington residents before any proposed change to residential.
122/1	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Growth in Cambridge is expected and supported in principle. However, there are significant concerns about the traffic impacts on Leamington, particularly along Shakespeare Street, which are not adequately addressed in Appendix 7 (Integrated Traffic Assessment). Shakespeare Street already experiences congestion during peak periods, and traffic volumes increase significantly during events at Lake Karapiro. The proposed development will add further pressure, as this route will act as a key connection for additional vehicle movements. The assessment assumes increased walking, cycling, and public transport use will reduce traffic demand. This is unlikely to meaningfully offset vehicle trips in this area due to commuting patterns and limited public transport options. Private vehicle use will remain the dominant mode. Several intersections on Shakespeare Street are already difficult and unsafe, particularly for right-turn movements, and are currently only controlled by give-way signage. Increased traffic will worsen these issues. It is critical that any required upgrades are implemented before or at the same time as development, not afterwards. Delayed infrastructure delivery will result in increased congestion and reduced safety for existing residents. A stronger application of Safe System principles is needed, including replacing priority-controlled intersections with safer, controlled designs where traffic volumes increase.	A stronger application of Safe System principles is needed, including replacing priority-controlled intersections with safer, controlled designs where traffic volumes increase. In particular: • Browning Street / Shakespeare Street requires a roundabout or traffic signals. • Wordsworth Street / Shakespeare Street requires a roundabout or traffic signals. • Raleigh Street / Shakespeare Street (serving a retail area) should be assessed and upgraded as needed as well as Campbell St / Shakespeare Street. Summary of key requests: • Reassess traffic impacts on Shakespeare Street using realistic assumptions • Upgrade key intersections (Browning, Wordsworth, Raleigh, Campbell) Deliver infrastructure upgrades prior to or concurrent with development.
123/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	This whole fixation with housing around Cambridge/Leamington and no infrastructure is strangling our beautiful town. I strongly oppose the development	I seek this proposal to be denied.
125/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Leamington is unable to accommodate the additional propose housing due to: • The current roading network is struggling to handle the existing traffic with the addition of additional housing • It is very difficult to get a doctors appoint just now at the Leamington Medical Centre (~3 - 4 weeks), additional housing is just going to add to this delay • Any additional housing should be located on the east side of Cambridge where there is ready access SH1 Over the past 15 years or so Leamington has had 550 new houses built at Cambridge Park/Riverside with a further 90 houses proposed for Te Awa Rise, the current roading system and infrastructure is struggling to cope with this increase in the number of dwellings.	To reject the proposed application
126/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The Waipa District Long Term Plan 2025-34 was based on extensive work and consultation with a clear brief to develop a plan that was doable and sustainable, allowing for projected growth in the medium term and proposed options for further growth after 2035 when demands and trends become clearer over the current decade. Areas were selected for housing and industrial development taking into account current and future infrastructure investment, so that limited district council and regional resources can be focused on agreed (by the council and community through consultation) priorities. This plan was only finalised late last year - and now already we have a significant proposal for a housing proposal that does not conform to the plan and in fact moves a large block of	Do not consent to this request for change of designation in part or in whole. Stick to the Long Term Plan until the impact of housing developments in current designated housing Zones, and the wider community demands and Council resources can be reassessed over the next decade. Any decision on this block of land should wait until much closer to the 2035 date before a review or change to land designation is made, to see what

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			land from rural to medium density housing. Although the development is a private one, the impacts of consenting to the proposal have important community and infrastructure impacts including the pressures on existing roading and bridges and set a precedent for undermining the cohesion of the Long Term Plan.	demands and pressures exist at that time, and whether the C5 Zone and the deferred Residential part of the Rider Block is still appropriate.
127/1	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Major concern is around schooling for the town. While there is likely space at Leamington Primary to accommodate the additional primary aged children, both the town middle school and high school are already very large in size and nearing capacity. Further increased congestion in the town around school drop off/pick up times. This is largely due to the fact that all people living on the Leamington side of the river need access to move across the already congested bridges at the same time to access schools for older children. I have similar reasoning around health and community services. Many of the Cambridge doctors are at or nearing capacity, or were when my wife and I enrolled 2 years ago, and with both an ageing population and an already growing population this should be factored in.	Access to another bridge to better manage traffic flows in the town and failing this there should be a strong consideration for schools to be built on the Leamington side of the river. considerations of additional access to health and community services given the growing populations.
129/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge is already growing at an unsustainable rate with facilities and infrastructure seriously lagging the population growth. This will exacerbate the situation even more. The nature of this change looks like a money grab despite the PR being put out. If the council agrees to this change then the full financial picture will need to be investigated in detail as it is outside normal working conditions for the council. I feel that this change is detrimental to Cambridge now and going forwards. I understand that some of the land may be developed in the future but that may still be 20-30 years away and may be found to be unnecessary when we get there.	Leave the zoning as it is currently.
130/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge cannot accommodate such a large influx of people. Extra cars means traffic build up in Leamington and the two bridges. More children - our schools are already at capacity. Shortage of doctors and dentists.	Please don't go ahead with this plan
132/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	There are also significant concerns around infrastructure and transport. The surrounding network is already under pressure, and development of this scale will require substantial upgrades to roads and three waters infrastructure. These upgrades must be clearly defined, funded, and delivered in step with development. Growth should not outpace infrastructure capacity. It is also important that developers contribute a fair share of the upfront infrastructure costs. Existing ratepayers should not be required to subsidise out-of-sequence development. Cambridge residents are already facing rising rates, while property values in some areas have softened or plateaued. This proposal risks adding further pressure.	I seek that Council decline the plan change in its current form.
134/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Our area experiences water alert levels during summer, and an increase in housing will likely put more pressure on local water resources and drainage systems. We need to consider whether our infrastructure can cope with the additional demand. The expansion of local facilities and amenities must be carefully planned to support a growing population. Without proper infrastructure and resource allocation, there could be a decline in the quality and accessibility of community services. The expansion of housing without adequate planning for educational facilities could strain existing resources and impact the quality of education.	I oppose the whole subdivision.
134/3	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	It was my understanding that Cambridge was expected to expand toward Hamilton, not towards the lake. I am concerned about urban sprawl extending to the lake area, which could have environmental and aesthetic impacts, as well as reduce the green space that is vital for our community's well-being. While development is inevitable, it must be balanced with careful planning to ensure safety, environmental sustainability, and community needs are prioritized. I strongly oppose the rezoning of this land without comprehensive assessments and infrastructure plans that address these critical issues.	I oppose the whole subdivision as my submission outlines
136/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	This proposal feels premature and unfair to existing residents. Infrastructure should come first — not after. Expecting the community to absorb the impacts now, with promises of future solutions, does not feel right. We are	

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			not against growth, but it needs to be done responsibly, with proper planning and respect for the people who already live here.	
137/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I oppose the development of this new subdivision until both the council and the developers have fully considered the broader infrastructure impacts that such growth would have on a small town like Cambridge. Cambridge is already under significant pressure from population growth, as shown by increasing traffic congestion and limited parking in the town centre. Essential services—including schools, medical practices, and childcare facilities—already have long waitlists, which will only worsen with further residential expansion. If this housing development is to proceed, developers must be willing to invest in and contribute meaningfully to local infrastructure, in partnership with the council.	To halt progress on the proposed residential development until necessary infrastructure improvements are in place to support Cambridge's growing population. The following improvements should be considered: • A new northbound State Highway 1 on-ramp from Leamington • An additional bridge across the Waikato River • Increased parking capacity in the town centre • Enhancements to local services, including expansion of the library Planning for large-scale retailers such as Farmers and Pak'n Save
138/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	A substantial proportion of Leamington residents need to cross the river for their basic needs. I note that as part of the documentation supporting the proposal that the consultants have determined that with two intersectional changes (at Wordsworth/Shakespeare Streets and Maungatautari Rd (Browning Street) and Shakespeare Road) existing road infrastructure is adequate to meet future needs - they have provided a fancy table to support the traffic flows based on daily averages, and which conveniently ignore peak flows. At a recent presentation to the Cambridge Rotary Club Mayor Mike Pettit advised that a future additional crossing of the river - a third bridge - was not in Council's short or medium term priorities that the planning, consultation, approvals and funding processes would take the actuality of a third bridge some time well in to the future. The potential residents in this proposed development will have the same needs to access the greater Cambridge facilities outlined above via the existing bridges - and these are already significantly congested at peak and school drop off/pick up times.	Rejection of the proposed plan changes.
138/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I note from the attachments to the proposed changes that the infrastructure changes identified are only proportionately related to the proposal. Am I correct in assuming that we, the ratepayers, will be expected to kick the can for the proportion of the costs they have claimed no responsibility for? In short, we will be subsidising their development costs.	Rejection of the proposed plan changes.
139/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Please stop extending the boundaries of our beautiful town. The town is struggling with the current infrastructure, lack of all-day parking for workers who work in our town. Lack of a public transport system. Every time you extend the town boundary you add to the problems that already exist, more cars on the already congested roads and the two bridges across the Waikato River.	Please retain the unique character of our beautiful town, continual growth is not always beautiful.
140/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Due to planned subdivision already in place and infill housing continuing this plan change not a priority at this stage. This will result in increased pressure on traffic in Leamington and services such as water delivery and wastewater all these will result in increase of rates to established ratepayers. Soon the new upgrade of wastewater treatment plant will be out of date.	Decline the plan change.
141/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	While I understand the need for growth and development in our district, I strongly believe that the current proposal does not adequately account for the existing strain on local infrastructure and community services. Our town is already experiencing significant pressure in several key areas: • Education capacity: Local schools are already at or near capacity. Additional residential development will place further strain on enrolment availability, resources, and quality of education for current and future students. • Traffic and roading: Traffic congestion is already a daily issue. The proposed increase in housing density will inevitably lead to more vehicles on roads that are not designed to handle this level of growth, increasing travel times and safety risks. • Infrastructure limitations: Core infrastructure such as water supply, stormwater systems, and wastewater services are already under pressure. Expanding residential zoning without clear, funded, and completed upgrades risks overloading these systems and reducing reliability for existing residents. • Waste management: Increased population will generate more waste, placing further demand on systems that are already stretched.	That Waipā District Council decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37 in its current form. In the alternative, if Council is minded to approve the plan change, I request that it only be approved subject to the following: • That development is staged and contingent on infrastructure capacity, including demonstrated upgrades to: - Transport and roading networks - Water supply, wastewater, and stormwater systems - Local schools and community facilities • That infrastructure upgrades are fully funded, planned, and in place prior to development, rather than delivered after population growth occurs. • That a comprehensive assessment of cumulative effects on traffic, schooling, water, and waste systems is undertaken and made publicly available.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			• Loss of balance in community planning: Rapid development without corresponding investment in infrastructure and services risks reducing the quality of life for current residents and undermining the long-term sustainability of the area. Development must be staged responsibly, with infrastructure and community services upgraded before or at least in parallel with any rezoning and increased density. The current proposal places undue pressure on already constrained infrastructure and does not provide sufficient certainty that necessary upgrades will occur in a timely manner.	That further intensification (medium density zoning) is reconsidered until it can be clearly shown that the existing community can sustainably support it.
143/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The impact on education is also significant due to Leamington having only 1 primary school, all senior secondary school pupils would have to commute to High School via the bridge to Cambridge.	No provisions / leave the farmland as is
145/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The proposal is premature and Cambridge infrastructure is not ready for development at this scale. The scale and density are out of keeping with the established feel and character of Cambridge. Traffic effects will be significant and existing roads are already under pressure. I believe that the Leamington infrastructure - roading, schooling, supermarkets, and medical centres, are all at capacity and could not absorb the inhabitants of 1250 new dwellings	That Council do not proceed with the implementation of Private Plan Change 37 - Rider Park Structure Plan.
147/1	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	To build a third bridge that services the Cambridge town to the north of the town. Have a on ramp to Hamilton at the top of the golf course hill and also an off range at the same location when travelling south	To have a third bridge built north of the town of Cambridge before the large scale development commences the sale of sections.
150/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	How are 1250 houses with an additional 2500-3000 people minimum going to access schools in Cambridge East or their place of work or looking to travel south, over logically one bridge - the low level bridge. We don't have the infrastructure in place for the increase of vehicles, let alone another bridge to service this.	Reject the application for Private Plan Change 37 Rider Park
151/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Refer Submission 152	refer Submission 152
152/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Water, we already have restrictions in summer, this will only increase the pressure on the system. (Even in the short term with trucks using water to assist in the management of the dust). Can out water and sewage systems cope. Parking, in Leamington and in Cambridge it is under pressure. (Even the council office parking is used to access the surrounding shops) Vehicles parking in Shakespeare St already restrict the vision when pulling from side streets into Shakespeare. There are already ongoing housing developments in many surrounding areas and the full impact of these is still to be felt. The Council needs to decide development direction and infrastructure needs and management. It needs to have a long-term plan and it needs to start implementing it now. The original planners of this town planned for a greenbelt. What are the current planners planning for?	Take stock - decide what Cambridge and Leamington are aiming to become. Make the most of the assets • Fix Te Kootu Lake, • improve walkways. • Encourage the use of Lake Karapiro for the general public not the special few. • Develop a long-term plan with clear timeframes for development. Include decisions on what must be in place before the next round of development can commence, and start the projects now.
153/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge has seen extensive growth over the past 10 years that council hasn't kept up with, in fact the opposite. There are problems already that need to be dealt with before another major subdivision is allowed. The council closed roads and put in extensive bike lanes, I understand the reason for it, but this has added pressure on the main routes through town. Leamington has not had the same provisions for bike lanes so many parents still drive, the bus services to schools is poorly lacking. There is limited space for the village to expand to allow for access, additional shops and parking. The town needs to grow in other ways first to accommodate an influx of population, not the other way around. We also have an ageing population who already struggle with navigating their way around town.	To reject the change to the plan, we do not need further subdivisions at this stage
155/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Prematurity & Infrastructure Deficit: The Waipā 2050 Growth Strategy specifically deferred this land until after 2035. This was to ensure infrastructure (specifically the Leamington bridge and wastewater pipes) could catch up. Approving this now creates an "infrastructure deficit" that the current community will have to live through. The existing wastewater infrastructure is insufficient to handle the increased load. The plan does not adequately demonstrate how the network will be upgraded to prevent overloads.	Decline Private Plan Change 37 in its current form. Alternatively: • require a funded upgrade to the Leamington roading network and a committed solution for bridge capacity before any development stages are approved. Delay rezoning until a funded plan for wastewater upgrades and 3 waters capacity is fully confirmed and proven to be sufficient.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
157/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I oppose the Rider Park development submission because the infrastructure in Cambridge is currently under strain. Schools, bridges, and some main routes such as Shakespeare Street are frequently over capacity. The quantity of houses and subsequent occupants of the proposed Rider Park would put extreme strain on Cambridges infrastructure. I propose that the Waipa council focuses on addressing infrastructure in Cambridge before any major developments are undertaken and stick to the current Waipa district plan for future developments.	I seek the Council to stick to the current district plan and decline the proposed Rider Park development.
160/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The roads in Leamington are already under pressure, especially from Heavy trucks.	Defer the plan until provision is made for improved infrastructure such as new roads and a new bridge.
162/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The proposal is premature- existing housing developments are not sold out and Cambridge infrastructure is not ready for a development of this scale in this location	To reject Private Plan Change 37-Rider Park Structure Plan
163/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	This is a departure from the existing district plan for this area. This is a major medium (to high) density housing development, Cambridge is already growing fast and this will put huge pressure on existing infrastructure.	I seek a rejection of the proposal for the rezoning of this land by Milan Park Stud, the original smaller deferred growth expansion plan be adhered to as outlined in the existing District Plan, the majority of this land be retained as productive farmland and the character and ambience of Cambridge be protected.
164/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge is already under infrastructure pressure. I am concerned that roads, transport links and local services will not cope with another large-scale development, particularly before a third bridge and wider network solutions are in place. Likely effects for nearby residents - further strain on infrastructure before major transport upgrade are in place.	To oppose the housing development. The Cambridge infrastructure needs development before anything like this.
165/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I don't think that the Leamington side of Cambridge is set up to handle yet more housing. The priority in the near future should be to get the roads sorted so that traffic flows better - to me that means having an on and off ramp near the golf course. By adding yet another subdivision it's going to put more cars on the road on Leamington side of town which we are not set up to cope with yet. I understand this subdivision is likely to happen in the future but don't think bringing it forward is a good idea until the roading / traffic flow issues are sorted out.	Whether the subdivision will go ahead or not.
166/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Expanding Cambridge to the southeast is illogical given the growing challenges to the transport network. It seems likely that most traffic pressure will come from the west and north of Cambridge (in the direction of Hamilton) and therefore it is logical that the town growth occurs in those directions. The Rider Park Structure Plan seeks to increase the population to the southeast which will directly add to the traffic pressure over the river and through the town centre. Cambridge should minimise the growth to the south & east until the town has a long-term transport plan to cope with the increased traffic.	Council should oppose the re-zoning of the land in question from Deferred Residential Zone and Rural Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone and oppose the change in extent of the C5 growth cell.
167/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Expanding Cambridge to the southeast is illogical given the growing challenges to the transport network. It seems likely that most traffic pressure will come from the west and north of Cambridge (in the direction of Hamilton) and therefore it is logical that the town growth occurs in those directions. The Rider Park Structure Plan seeks to increase the population to the southeast which will directly add to the traffic pressure over the river and through the town centre. Cambridge should minimise the growth to the south & east until the town has a long-term transport plan to cope with the increased traffic.	Council should oppose the re-zoning of the land in question from Deferred Residential Zone and Rural Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone and oppose the change in extent of the C5 growth cell.
168/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I would like to understand the future development of infrastructure and in particular schooling capacity which are planned for with the expected growth in Leamington population envisaged under this plan change.	Review of capacity in Leamington Schools, for middle school and High School and adequate provision for increased student numbers planned in existing schools, or provision for schools.
169/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge is already under infrastructure pressure. Added pressure on local services and infrastructure before transport improvements are completed	I oppose the Plan Change
170/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The proposal is premature with insufficient infrastructure for a development of this scale. We have lived on the corner of Browning Street and Carlyle Street for the last 25 years and have seen the growth of urban houses being built outside the greenbelt. This has increased substantially, but still is the same route that the milk tankers take every night into the early hours. The need for a 3rd bridge and off ramp for Leamington should be paramount before this type of subdivision is developed.	I would like the subdivision to be put on hold until correct infrastructure has been put in place and all these concerns have been addressed.
172/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	We do not have the infrastructure in place of a development of this magnitude. One major bridge, that can be assessed by large vehicles. Plus have we got enough resources for roading, drainage etc, that this development would require. There will be increased traffic.	To not let this submission go ahead

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
173/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	We do not have the infrastructure in place of a development of this magnitude. One major bridge, that can be assessed by large vehicles. Plus have we got enough resources for roading, drainage etc, that this development would require. There will be increased traffic.	Not specified
174/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Also schooling, medical centres need to be considered	Add in a new bridge or find a solution to the extra traffic this will cause
176/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	To bring forward and substantially increase, the development at the Rider property appears to only benefit one party with no obvious positives for the current wider community, especially with regard to infrastructure and traffic. Its impact on neighbouring properties, traffic congestion and infrastructure would appear to currently outweigh any benefits to the rural Maungatautari and wider Cambridge community.	We ask Council to retain the deferred development of the C5 growth cell until 2035 and not allow the remainder of the property to be rezoned from rural to medium density residential.
176/3	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The current congestion around the town's two bridges, and within the town's main service centre in Cambridge CBD is so obvious and problematic that the Council approved related 'problem statements' at the Strategic Policy and Planning Committee on Wednesday, December 3 2025, which implies it is a priority for Council. With the current Cambridge Connections project currently underway to explore solutions, to 'jump the gun' and develop an extra 1250 residences on the Leamington side of the bridges, so arguably an additional 2000+ cars, will only add another layer to this urgent and over-riding issue for Cambridge. We feel it would be irresponsible for Council not to prioritise the Cambridge Connections work and the necessary upgrading and increase in waste and fresh water infrastructure before this development is considered.	We ask Council to retain the deferred development of the C5 growth cell until 2035 and not allow the remainder of the property to be rezoned from rural to medium density residential.
177/3	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I don't believe Cambridge has the infrastructure to house more people. Our Supermarkets, Petrol Stations, Eatery's, Shops are already so busy, There is waiting lists for nearly all the daycare centres, getting a park in town is non-existent, a Doctors appointment take 2-3 weeks... adding more people is just going to create more pressure. Not to mention our Fire station is on the Cambridge side of town manned by amazing volunteers (bigger area = more volunteers needed, More engines needed) - Our police station is not manned at night.... ambulances can already take hours to get to you.. Our Schools are Full.	I think the subdivision should be put on hold until infrastructure has been improved. I believe a bridge at the south end of the expressway into Leamington is needed before more subdivisions.
178/6	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The proposal does not adequately address the capacity of existing education infrastructure. There is currently one larger primary school serving the area, Leamington School, as well as Roto-o-Rangi Country School nearby. The anticipated population growth associated with PC37 is likely to place significant pressure on these schools. It is unclear whether the Ministry of Education has been consulted or whether future school capacity has been planned for. Without appropriate planning for education and community infrastructure, development risks placing undue strain on families, schools, and the wider community.	That the Council decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37 as notified, or substantially amend it to address the matters raised in this submission before any approval is considered.
179/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Oppose not enough infrastructure	Oppose not enough infrastructure
180/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Significant addition of homes and development on the southern side of the Waikato River at this location without the addition of one or more river crossings to service the Cambridge/Leamington area will add considerable traffic to the region without making allowance for the bottle necks that are the current two bridges. This is of particular concern to myself and my whanau as residents of Shakespeare St, which already sees considerable road usage as the heavy transport route across the river.	Decline the proposal in its current state and, at minimum, add condition that a portion of monetary proceeds from any potential land development be put towards an additional river crossing to service the growth.
188/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Delay until infrastructure can support even a lower density	Reject proposed change
191/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The proposed plan change is not in keeping with WAIPA DC's 30 year plan. The idea that we would spend the best part of a decade funding infrastructure and zoning land to the northern side of town where geographically and commercially more appropriate only to consider jamming 1500 homes onto a horse stud on the southern side of town is farcical. It's not in keeping with planned growth areas, traffic planning, or what is best suited to cater for the towns growth. This plan would place growth at the furthest possible location from traffic and infrastructure connections and the majority of employment sites/businesses to the north.	Reject the application for the private plan change so generations of family's can continue to live and enjoy the amenity that currently exits. Keep the growth within the current plan area
193/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	There needs to be a new bridge built over the river before developments of this size can be constructed in Leamington. Developments should be focused on the Cambridge side of the bridge closer to Hamilton until a new bridge is constructed.	Whole proposal to be on hold until a new bridge is constructed over the Waikato river and the roading and infrastructure is ready to accommodate the proposed growth.
194/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Increased housing is not required with current volumes of new development and infill due to current plan changes. Five new houses have been built in the street I live on in the space of two former properties, with no additional	To either not approve the proposal due to the impact it will have on the current and future community, without any substantial need.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			infrastructure which has increased on road parking and hazards. More properties are not needed as these also took several months to occupy. Without infrastructure and improved resources, it will create more demand on limited resources and increase wider council costs, meaning everyone is paying for the benefits of the developer, who should cover the infrastructure costs	If the proposal is approved all costs for increased infrastructure within a 15km radius need to be covered by the developer and not the community.
195/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I would like to see a 3rd bridge and infrastructure fixed first	A deferment of said housing plans till the roads/bridges are sorted along with the infrastructure
199/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The town's infrastructure struggles to cope now with the recent developments: Rymans, Somerset, Cycleways. We are overloaded in many ways now. It is well acknowledged that we need to improve the infrastructure of the town's roading / bridge capacity and transport services – this must be done BEFORE adding more stress into the entire system.	We seek to request the Council declines the application for the plan change affecting the 52.89 hectares currently designated rural - and that the land remains designated rural.
199/4	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Infrastructure Pressures: • Finding parking in the town centre gets more and more difficult daily, including weekends. • When will the town migrate to a bin collection system? • Water - the current quality is terrible and desperately needs investment. We are still under water restrictions and have been since early January. This new development will add at least 3375 people, what does this mean for our water resources? • Our library struggles to cope with membership and the number of books housed. • Its already impossible to see a doctor in the area inside of two weeks (and our doctors apparently have good capacity). • with the removal of the NZPost service at Leamington people will be forced into town to Paper Plus with their small desk, bickering staff and constant queues. • We will need another supermarket to keep up. Is there a site anywhere large enough for the development a new supermarket? • Is there enough school capacity? Are there enough jobs to support these homes?	We seek to request the Council declines the application for the plan change affecting the 52.89 hectares currently designated rural - and that the land remains designated rural.
200/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Services in Leamington are already in high demand. There is a single primary school which may not be able to provide for a significantly increased roll, which may result from the proposed subdivision. There is a shortage of doctors, with long waiting times for a family doctor appointment. The only supermarket has limited parking in a very busy shopping area.	To refuse the plan change to medium density housing for this land. To require alternate plans for access and facilities in the subdivision before any plan changes or planning permission is considered
201/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I oppose the development of so many new residential properties without the addition of a new school and a new bridge in Cambridge. Leamington primary is already the only primary school most people in Leamington are zoned for and already has a very large number of students with large class sizes. We need another school in Leamington if we are to add so many new people to the population and we also need another bridge to deal with traffic at peak times.	To deny the proposal for new residential land or to require the planning of another school and new bridge linking Cambridge to Leamington to start before such rezoning can be approved.
202/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	We don't have the infrastructure in place to support this housing development in terms of roading and schools in Leamington and Pukekura.	The Council should not approve this change to plan due to safety concerns with roading, and lack of supporting infrastructure including schools and bridges.
203/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	As a resident who will be directly affected by this development, our roads, transport links and local services will not cope with another large-scale development, particularly before a third bridge and wider network solutions are in place. I believe this proposal is premature and Cambridge infrastructure is not ready for development of this scale.	No, this development & private plan change 37 cannot go ahead.
204/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The more houses that are built here, the more congested our roads become, our infrastructure is overloaded & more houses brings more crime to the area.	Not allow building consent for further development at Ryder Park. Decline plan change 37 - Ryder Park
206/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The rapid growth in Cambridge's population over the past 10 years has already placed pressure on existing traffic, parking, bridge, medical, and retailing infrastructure. A further 1,269 dwellings on the Leamington side of the river will exacerbate existing capacity issues in Cambridge, particularly for Leamington residents. In particular this will place further pressure on traffic corridors through Leamington and over the two Waikato River bridges, on Leamington Medical Centre and on Leamington School.	I request the council declines to rezone this land as proposed.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			I note the land will automatically rezone in 2035 to allow subdivision and hope that by that time WDC or central government will have made improvements to local infrastructure that would lessen the impact of a large-scale residential subdivision.	
207/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	It is also stated in the proposed plan that it is close to transport services, but that is incorrect...which raises the point: From what point in the proposed subdivision are distances to services, schools, and other facilities measured? It would appear to have been taken at the nearest possible point, and in fact would not be accurate for the majority of the new residents.	Do not allow any part of this Proposed Plan Change to go ahead.
211/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge cannot cope with an extra 1250 houses and increase in population. The infrastructure in Cambridge & Leamington are already under immense pressure. Amenities in Cambridge & Leamington are under pressure now.	Not specified
212/1	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	How is the present infrastructure for water and sewerage going to cope? I wrote to Council 3 years ago re flooding on Tennyson St and footpath. Nothing has been done to date.	Plans for increased infrastructure.
213/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Is the Council able to assure us that this increase in housing will not put undue strain on our current water capacity? Likewise, even if this is developed in stages it will still draw on our finite water supply.	The council to deny permission for this development to go ahead in any form
214/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Against more development before the establishment of the infrastructure to support more people and cars in Cambridge. Cambridge is at breaking point already. There needs to be a road from his property onto the expressway. There needs to be a bigger supermarket.	Oppose
215/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The Rider Park area is identified as a future growth area intended for development post-2035. This sequencing reflects a coordinated approach to urban expansion, ensuring that infrastructure, services, and community facilities are delivered alongside growth. Bringing this development forward undermines that framework and creates pressure on infrastructure that is not yet in place. The submitters' property is also located within a future growth cell intended for post-2035 development. They have accepted this framework, including associated impacts, on the basis that development would occur in a staged and coordinated manner. This proposal introduces inconsistency and uncertainty.	Decline the plan change in its current form; or Alternatively, require that development: • aligns with planned post-2035 sequencing does not proceed ahead of confirmed infrastructure delivery
215/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge is already experiencing increasing pressure on key infrastructure, particularly transport. The town is divided by the Waikato River and relies on a limited number of bridge connections. Congestion is already evident, and future infrastructure improvements remain some years away. The proposal introduces approximately 1,200–1,300 dwellings, creating significant additional demand on transport networks, schools and education facilities, medical and emergency services, retail and community infrastructure. There is insufficient certainty regarding the timing of infrastructure delivery, funding responsibility and sequencing relative to development. Development should not proceed ahead of confirmed infrastructure capacity.	Decline the plan change in its current form; or Alternatively, require that development: • aligns with planned post-2035 sequencing • does not proceed ahead of confirmed infrastructure delivery • includes guaranteed funding and timing for transport upgrades addresses safety issues at key intersections prior to development thresholds
215/6	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The scale and timing of the proposal will contribute to wider cumulative effects across Cambridge, including increased pressure on already constrained transport networks, additional demand on schools, healthcare, and services, strain on community infrastructure. These effects extend beyond the immediate site and require careful consideration.	Decline the plan change in its current form; or Alternatively, require that development: • aligns with planned post-2035 sequencing does not proceed ahead of confirmed infrastructure delivery
216/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The Cambridge service delivery is already under significant pressure as it is, additional housing, specifically to the scale of this PC will increase that pressure. Basics like getting a medical appointment in Leamington can be a 2 week wait. Even if another medical centre opens it won't be enough to decrease the pressure. That is one matter, but huge for a resident.	To consider existing residents and rate payers like myself, the impact it will have. To discard the entire PC. That is a simple and only request.
218/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The proposed development is out of sequence with planned growth. The area is not identified for development until after 2035. Future growth areas identified in the Waipa District Plan have been strategically staged to ensure essential infrastructure such as schools, supermarkets, roads and medical centres are delivered alongside population growth. Leamington and Cambridge are simply not equipped to support development at this scale at this time. Particularly given the pressure already on the bridges and through the town centre.	Decline the application.
219/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	This development is too large, too soon and insufficiently supported by infrastructure. My key concerns are: • The significant additional traffic pressure on Cambridge and Leamington roads • Development ahead of confirmed river-crossing and transport solutions • Medium-density urban development is being pushed into a sensitive semi-rural edge of Leamington before the area is properly ready	That the Proposed Private Plan Change 37 be declined in full

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			The proposed private plan change is touted as a great development for Cambridge, however, the greater benefit for Cambridge is leaving the land zoning alone until 2035 as dictated in the current town plan.	
221/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The development is too large, too soon and insufficiently supported by infrastructure. My concerns are: • The significant additional traffic pressure in Cambridge and Leamington Development ahead of confirmed river-crossing and transport solutions	I seek that the Proposed private plan change 37 be declined in full
222/4	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Sufficient consideration has not been given to the cumulative impact this development will have on existing residents. Our town is already bursting at the seams, and further large-scale development without adequate infrastructure upgrades will only compound existing issues rather than resolve them.	To leave the zone for rural use not change to residential zoning
223/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The number of proposed dwellings is too many. Leamington has a village feel which will be destroyed by the proposal. There isn't the infrastructure in place to support. it. The road network will become even more clogged, especially across the 2 bridges.	Limit the proposal to rural residential.
225/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The proposed development appears to be out of sequence with planned growth, particularly in relation to the rezoning of the rural zoned land. I understand that approximately half of the site is already identified as deferred residential, however the remaining portion is currently zoned rural. Future growth areas identified in the Waipā District Plan appear to have been strategically staged to ensure essential infrastructure such as schools, commercial centres, roads and community facilities are delivered alongside population growth. I am concerned that bringing forward the rural zoned land for development undermines this sequencing, and that Leamington and Cambridge are not currently	I oppose the proposed plan change
225/12	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Bringing this development forward may place additional pressure on existing infrastructure and services, including roads, water supply, wastewater, and community facilities. Given that this area does not appear to have been planned for development until a later stage, I am not confident that the necessary infrastructure will be in place to support this level of growth. If additional infrastructure upgrades are required to service this development, it is unclear how these costs will be funded and whether they may ultimately be borne by existing ratepayers.	I oppose the proposed plan change
226/3	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Once the development is complete it will be so over populated in this already bustling, crowded little town, we do not have the facilities to accommodate this kind of exponential growth.	I would like this plan to be scrapped or at the very least compensated for the financial loss which this will impact on the value of our property.
227/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The proposal will add a substantial new population and will increase demand on local amenities, recreational spaces, schools, community facilities and local services. Even if some new reserve land is created within the structure plan, this does not adequately mitigate the broader pressure placed on existing amenities used by Leamington residents. We are particularly concerned that growth of this scale will occur ahead of confirmed, funded and delivered transport and service upgrades that would be necessary to maintain access and quality of life for existing residents.	That Council reject Private Plan Change PC37.
227/5	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	PC37 seeks to bring forward development on land identified for development beyond 2035 and expand beyond the defined growth cell into additional rural land. The Growth Strategy itself plans for approximately 732 dwellings in the C5 growth cell, but the Rider Park development seeks to exceed this by 518 dwellings. We oppose the scale of this proposed development and this out-of-sequence approach. It undermines the integrity of the District Plan's staged growth framework and creates an undesirable precedent for other out-of-sequence proposals. There is inadequate justification for approving a development of this scale and pushing it ahead of the planned timeframe when local schooling and transport constraints—particularly river crossing capacity and resilience—are already recognised by Council as unresolved problems.	That Council reject Private Plan Change PC37.
227/6	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The proposal relies on later-stage design, consents, and a Private Development Agreement (PDA) to resolve infrastructure, staging and funding matters. A PDA is outside the RMA planning framework and does not provide the same level of enforceable certainty as plan provisions. Rezoning should not be granted on the basis that critical infrastructure and transport risks will be resolved later.	That Council reject Private Plan Change PC37.
228/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	A development of this scale will also increase pressures on local resources, services and amenities which are already under strain. Additionally, the proposed development will increase strain on traffic infrastructure. Cambridge has seen significant growth recently through developments. We are already seeing the adverse affects through increase traffic and difficulty with parking in the town centre.	I am seeking council to not allow the proposed changes to be approved

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
229/1	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	District Plan provisions determine the physical form, access, servicing, and intensity of development, which in turn shape the environments in which Fire and Emergency must respond. Medium density development can increase the scale, frequency, and complexity of incidents, places greater demands on firefighting water supply and emergency access and can increase risks to occupants and responders if not appropriately planned. Fire and Emergency's submission therefore seeks to ensure that the proposed provisions of PPC37 enable growth in a manner that is serviceable, safe, and resilient, and that avoids embedding avoidable emergency risk into the built environment. Section 15 – 'Infrastructure, Hazards, Development and Subdivision' of the Operative Waipā District Plan sets out the firefighting water supply requirements. Rule 15.4.2.18 requires all lots in a subdivision and any sites in a development in the Medium Density Residential and Commercial Zones within the urban limits to be connected to Council's water supply for firefighting purposes. Based on the PPC37 documentation, it does not appear as though PPC37 intends to extend the urban limit on the Waipā District Planning maps to capture the plan change area. As such, this would mean that the PPC37 area would not be subject to Rule 15.4.2.18 and future development would not be subject to the additional infrastructure servicing requirements. This highlights a statutory gap between the proposed PPC37 framework and the current Operative Waipā District Plan provisions, which, when read together, do not clearly or enforceably require firefighting water supply outcomes proportionate to the medium density development enabled.	That the urban limit be extended to include the PPC37 area so that Rule 15.4.2.18 applies; or A specific rule be inserted in the Waipā District Plan via PPC37 be introduced requiring that 'all buildings within the Rider Park Structure Plan area must be provided with a water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supply Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008'.
230/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge does not have the appropriate infrastructure to support this amount of new homes. There will be increased traffic which will have a detrimental environmental impact as well as insufficient supermarkets, schools and access to medical support, specifically GPs it is steady difficult for people new to Cambridge to get registered with a medical centre.	To not approve the change to Medium Density Residential Zone or the change to the Structure Plan for the area, to be known as Rider Park Structure Plan.
231/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	This proposal is premature and insufficiently supported by the infrastructure required to sustain development of this scale without significant adverse impacts on the town and its residents. Cambridge already experiences congestion, particularly at peak times, and this proposal would exacerbate existing pressures. Bridges are struggling to meet current demand, and until we have an alternative river crossing this development seems premature.	I urge Council to reconsider this proposal until comprehensive infrastructure planning—including transport, bridges, parking, and safety measures—is demonstrably in place. Growth should be carefully staged, aligned with infrastructure delivery, and designed to protect Cambridge's unique character and liveability.
234/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Our infrastructure needs exist now. While the bridge issue may take the spotlight, the serious issues are healthcare and education. We can hardly get in to see a doctor, and have to travel across town. Our wonderful locally zoned primary school is full to the brim. We need to put public infrastructure before private plans. One persons deep pockets are not worth more than a child's need for access to education and healthcare.	The proposed private plan change to Rider Park should be dismissed entirely
235/3	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	There is plenty of evidence that Cambridge has grown to the extent that the provision of adequate schooling capacity has been deferred.	I seek that Council decline this plan change, and any other early opening of planned residential areas until such time as provision of adequate future schooling is provided.
238/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	I am concerned that the proposed development is out of sequence with planned growth for this area, which I understand is not identified for development until after 2035. As a ratepayer, the information provided in the application does not reassure me that unplanned demand on infrastructure will be avoided, or that it will not lead to further rates increases and/or a decline in the level of service we currently rely on.	Decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37 (Rider Park Structure Plan). Alternatively, if Council is minded to approve all or part of the plan change, approve it only with whatever amendments, staging, and/or conditions Council considers appropriate to address the concerns raised in submissions and evidence (including any further information, assessment, or consultation Council considers necessary). Grant any other relief that Council considers appropriate and consistent with the purpose of the plan change process.
240/3	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Sustainable growth requires the delivery of complete communities. The Chamber considers there is insufficient clarity regarding healthcare provision (GPs, medical services), schooling capacity and future demand, community and recreational infrastructure. Without alignment between residential growth and these services, there is risk of strain on existing infrastructure and reduced quality of life.	Demonstrate how social infrastructure will scale alongside residential growth, including timing and delivery mechanisms. Infrastructure Capacity & Delivery

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
				• What is the current capacity of three waters infrastructure (water, wastewater, stormwater)? How will infrastructure be staged alongside development to avoid lag?
241/11	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge town is already under severe pressure from current traffic flows and it is accepted wisdom that another bridge is required if the town is to remain a vibrant place that people want to shop in and live in. The increase in people and traffic that the proposal will bring without another crossing being in place will severely adversely impact the current parlous situation.	That the proposed plan change be rejected
241/3	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Upgrading roading infrastructure before the anticipated start date of the proposal is simply not feasible given the necessary lead in times and especially given council is unable to maintain the existing roading infrastructure to a satisfactory standard. Putting scarce resources into facilitating a new development will further degrade the already poor maintenance and service standards. That fact alone means that the proposal is premature.	That the proposed plan change be rejected
241/6	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The scale and density of the proposal will see the collapse of medical care here as the current health facilities simply cannot support more patient demand. New facilities are desperately needed now but almost certainly will not be provided in the foreseeable future. The proposal will significantly adversely affect existing and new residents access to already stretched services and lead to poorer outcomes for all.	That the proposed plan change be rejected
242/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Any more additions to the population will cause undue stress on the existing citizens who are already struggling with parking (in Cambridge town and areas), congestion (in Cambridge, Leamington and the two bridges), and medical facilities (in particular lack of emergency facilities).	To decline the proposal for more housing.
243/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Any more additions to the population will cause undue stress on the existing citizens who are already struggling with parking (in Cambridge town and areas), congestion (in Cambridge, Leamington and the two bridges), and medical facilities (in particular lack of emergency facilities).	To decline the proposal for more housing.
244/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Any more additions to the population will cause undue stress on the existing citizens who are already struggling with parking (in Cambridge town and areas), congestion (in Cambridge, Leamington and the two bridges), and medical facilities (in particular lack of emergency facilities).	For the proposal to be declined.
246/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Object to PC37 in its entirety because of lack of infrastructure including third bridge, roads (already congested), and access north onto expressway from Tirau Road.	That this plan be declined in its totality, or at least deferred until infrastructure is addressed satisfactorily
249/4	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	There is currently one primary school in Leamington. All other schooling is located on the north side of the river in Cambridge. For health and safety purposes a third bridge should be a priority with emphasis on good pedestrian access catering for young people using bikes and scooters.	The construction of a third bridge across the Waikato River, directly connecting Leamington and Cambridge.
252/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The C5 Growth Cell, to our understanding, was not to be undertaken until 2035 and beyond. Therefore, it is a surprise to us that this plan change brings development forward by 9 years.	That Council does not proceed with this proposed plan change.
253/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Key concern is whether bringing forward deferred land aligns with Waipā's agreed growth sequencing and planning framework. The Board notes that much of the land subject to PC37 is currently identified for later-stage growth, signalling that development of this area was not anticipated in the short to medium term under the operative District Plan. Matters for consideration include: • The rationale for advancing land identified for post-2035 growth, including impacts on productive rural land • The relationship between PC37 and existing growth cells, live and active residential developments and Council's broader growth, infrastructure and investment planning framework Avoiding development that runs ahead of servicing capacity, funding certainty and transport readiness	That clarification be provided on: • What immediate housing or land supply shortfall PC37 is intended to address that is not already provided for within existing live developments and zoned growth cells. • Whether sufficient land already zoned for residential development has been, or could be, sensibly brought online ahead of advancing deferred land What precedent may this plan change set for other deferred or rural land across the district
253/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Key concern is whether infrastructure, including social infrastructure, is available, deliverable, and fairly funded, without transferring undue costs or service pressures onto existing ratepayers. The Cambridge Community Board considers infrastructure readiness to be a critical determinant of whether the plan change should proceed in its current form. This includes not only three waters and transport infrastructure, but also the social infrastructure required to support a well-functioning community. Areas of focus include: • Transport and roading • Three waters infrastructure • The long-term operational and maintenance implications for Council systems • Parks, reserves and public spaces	That clarity and assurance be provided on: • What infrastructure capacity is confirmed and available at the time of development, rather than being reliant on future upgrades or aspirational planning • How the development will fairly contribute to existing Council infrastructure, including roads, pipes, parks and community facilities that will experience increased demand • How costs associated with upgrading, expanding or maintaining shared infrastructure will be allocated, and how ratepayer exposure will be avoided

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			Infrastructure readiness is not limited to what can be built within the site boundary, but includes the capacity, resilience and funding of the wider systems upon which the development will rely.	• How cumulative effects will be assessed where PC37 comes forward alongside other developments within Cambridge and Leamington • What safeguards exist should enabling infrastructure or social services fail to keep pace with development
253/8	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The Board wishes to understand whether assumptions adequately reflect long-term risks and pressures. In particular: • Growth being enabled in step with infrastructure, not in advance of it. • Using sequencing to manage ratepayer risk and community impact. • Flooding and stormwater modelling assumptions. • Climate change resilience. Provision and protection of open space and ecological connections.	That clarity be provided on: • The level of conservatism applied in hazard and infrastructure modelling. • How risks are managed if future climate impacts exceed current assumptions. Whether mitigation measures are enforceable through plan provisions.
253/9	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Key concern is ensuring development proceeds only when enabling conditions are met. The Board notes the importance of clear staging provisions, infrastructure trigger points, and monitoring and review mechanisms.	Provide greater clarity around “no-go” conditions if infrastructure or funding is not delivered and visibility of how outcomes will be monitored over time.
254/1	Support in Part	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Appendix 15 "Prior to 2035 infrastructure costs borne by developer". Does this apply to infrastructure specifically within the development, or could the developer contribute to a significant upgrade just outside the development to offset some of these inside the development expectations from council, namely bolstering the playground at Gywneth Common". Gywneth Common with its safe access concerns, unsuitable parking and small playground offering is crying out for additional investment, the Common is under utilised, but within strolling distance of the new development.	Investigate the option for the developer to contribute to Gywneth Common redevelopment as a safer destination for the Community & Visitors
255/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Our infrastructure is already under significant pressure. Roads are congested, and essential services such as schools, healthcare, and public transport are operating at or near capacity. A development of this scale would further strain these systems and negatively impact residents’ quality of life.	To not go ahead with this proposal! This would in no way be in the best interest of our town and community
255/3	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	There is also insufficient clarity around how and when necessary infrastructure improvements would be delivered to support this growth. I urge that this proposal be reconsidered, or at minimum, that any development be contingent on clear, funded infrastructure upgrades and proper planning to ensure sustainable growth.	To not go ahead with this proposal! This would in no way be in the best interest of our town and community
256/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	There is a significant potential for additional housing in the urban environment, already zoned, over the proposed time frame of the proposed development. Full development of the site is anticipated to take a minimum of 10-12 years. Council should have a clear full picture of capacity of the township and what existing zoning capacity is.	Reject this plan change to ensure that Cambridge does not end up with a hollow core, and urban sprawl.
256/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Concern is that if Council continues to zone further land around the periphery of the town, the town has a very strong potential to end up with a ‘hollow core’. Land within the developed area is currently being landbanked, for medium term redevelopment. This will continue to occur, until economics indicate such redevelopment is feasible. Continued greenfield properties coming to the market on the edge of the township, have the potential to reduce the economics of this redevelopment, again potentially creating a 'hollow core' to the town. In order to maintain the cohesive and character nature of the township, and not suffer from extensive sprawl, and having a hollow centre, Council must ensure that policies including zoning work, enables this main towns existing residential areas to be vibrant.	Reject this plan change to ensure that Cambridge does not end up with a hollow core, and urban sprawl.
257/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The proposed development is out of sequence with planned growth. The area is not identified for development until after 2035. Future growth areas identified in the Waipa District Plan have been strategically staged to ensure essential infrastructure is delivered alongside population growth. Leamington and Cambridge are not equipped to support development at this scale at this time.	Decline
261/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Concerned that this plan change brings forward a substantial development ahead of its originally anticipated timeframe, at a point where Cambridge is already experiencing multiple active growth fronts across several growth cells. In my view, we have not yet had the opportunity to properly absorb and “settle” the impacts of those developments in terms of infrastructure capacity and community outcomes. There are already a number of active developments underway across Cambridge, including C1, C2, C3, and Leamington C4 and C6. In addition, there are a number of intensification projects occurring across the town, where existing sites are being redeveloped from one or two dwellings into higher-density housing. the cumulative effect of these developments is already creating additional pressure within the existing town boundary, even before further large-scale development is introduced.	To consider the following points in relation to this plan change: • That careful consideration is given to whether advancing the proposed plan change ahead of its original staging timeframe is appropriate at this time • That further assessment is undertaken of the cumulative effects of existing and already consented developments across Cambridge before additional large-scale rezoning is progressed. • That infrastructure capacity (including transport, water, wastewater, healthcare, education, and community services) continues to be closely

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			I question whether it is appropriate to bring forward another major development site, which I believe is currently earmarked for development from around 2035, for approximately 735 homes (and now potentially up to 1,200 homes), without a clearer understanding of how the combined effects of growth across Cambridge will be managed.	considered alongside growth, to help ensure it remains aligned over time. That a staged and coordinated approach to growth continues to be maintained where possible, in order to support the ongoing liveability, character, and service levels of Cambridge.
261/3	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	It is unclear where the additional student population from this development will be accommodated without further strain or the need for accelerated school expansion. This concern is shared with early learning centres too as well as places such as swimming schools, sport clubs etc. and raises concerns about whether education infrastructure is being delivered in step with housing growth.	To consider the following points in relation to this plan change: • That careful consideration is given to whether advancing the proposed plan change ahead of its original staging timeframe is appropriate at this time • That further assessment is undertaken of the cumulative effects of existing and already consented developments across Cambridge before additional large-scale rezoning is progressed. • That infrastructure capacity (including transport, water, wastewater, healthcare, education, and community services) continues to be closely considered alongside growth, to help ensure it remains aligned over time. • That a staged and coordinated approach to growth continues to be maintained where possible, in order to support the ongoing liveability, character, and service levels of Cambridge.
261/4	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The existing health infrastructure, including general practices and the planned Cambridge health hub/medical centre expansion, is already experiencing capacity pressure. - Residents have difficulty accessing timely GP appointments, with increasing wait times for enrolments and consultations. Any delay or phasing mismatch in the delivery of new healthcare centres would likely compound existing access issues as the population increases.	To consider the following points in relation to this plan change: • That careful consideration is given to whether advancing the proposed plan change ahead of its original staging timeframe is appropriate at this time • That further assessment is undertaken of the cumulative effects of existing and already consented developments across Cambridge before additional large-scale rezoning is progressed. • That infrastructure capacity (including transport, water, wastewater, healthcare, education, and community services) continues to be closely considered alongside growth, to help ensure it remains aligned over time. • That a staged and coordinated approach to growth continues to be maintained where possible, in order to support the ongoing liveability, character, and service levels of Cambridge.
261/6	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Waste and recycling services are already showing signs of strain, including occasional delayed collections. - Rapid population increases tend to amplify operational pressure on council services before additional capacity is fully funded or delivered. There is also a broader concern about whether service delivery (waste, parks maintenance, stormwater response) can realistically scale at the same pace as population growth. This is particularly important for the likes of the Cambridge library which is far outgrown the current building and would struggle to accommodate the expected community.	To consider the following points in relation to this plan change: • That careful consideration is given to whether advancing the proposed plan change ahead of its original staging timeframe is appropriate at this time • That further assessment is undertaken of the cumulative effects of existing and already consented developments across Cambridge before additional large-scale rezoning is progressed. • That infrastructure capacity (including transport, water, wastewater, healthcare, education, and community services) continues to be closely considered alongside growth, to help ensure it remains aligned over time. • That a staged and coordinated approach to growth continues to be maintained where possible, in order to support the ongoing liveability, character, and service levels of Cambridge.
261/7	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Water infrastructure is already under increasing demand from current growth cells. There are ongoing questions about system resilience and stormwater capacity. Concerns remain around whether potable water pressure, wastewater capacity, and downstream treatment systems can support additional large-scale growth without	To consider the following points in relation to this plan change:

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			upgrades being fully in place first. There is also uncertainty around current supply and servicing capacity for new connections on the southern and western edges of the district, with supply coming from Lake Karapiro. Is that a potential future for this side of the district if a civil emergency hits, with infrastructure stretched.	• That careful consideration is given to whether advancing the proposed plan change ahead of its original staging timeframe is appropriate at this time • That further assessment is undertaken of the cumulative effects of existing and already consented developments across Cambridge before additional large-scale rezoning is progressed. • That infrastructure capacity (including transport, water, wastewater, healthcare, education, and community services) continues to be closely considered alongside growth, to help ensure it remains aligned over time. • That a staged and coordinated approach to growth continues to be maintained where possible, in order to support the ongoing liveability, character, and service levels of Cambridge.
262/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	We do not believe that PPC37 justifies this out-of-sequence and unplanned development. The plan change area is also simply too large. Even if some growth in this general area is eventually needed, that does not justify rezoning the full 98 ha, especially the Rural zoned land outside the deferred planning framework. The scale of the request is broader than necessary and inconsistent with the carefully planned and sequenced release model envisaged by the District Plan and Strategy. PPC37 will enable over 1,250 dwellings in the near to medium term, compared to the District Plan's forecast of 732 dwellings in C5 over the long term. The applicant relies on housing supply benefits to justify the proposal. However, it has not shown there is a genuine near or medium-term capacity shortfall that warrants activating C5 ahead of its programmed development timeframe, let alone the additional rezoning 52 ha of Rural zoned land that is not earmarked for housing at all.	We seek that Proposed Private Plan Change 37 be declined in full. In the alternative, if the Hearing Panel is not minded to decline the plan change entirely, we seek the following relief: • That all Rural zoned land outside the Deferred Residential framework in the District Plan be excluded from the rezoning. • That no rezoning or development proceed until core transport infrastructure is identified, funded and operational, including confirmed solutions for Cambridge river-crossing resilience and local network effects. • That no rezoning or development proceed until all necessary water supply and wastewater infrastructure is fully identified, funded, and operational for the scale of development proposed. • That the proposal be reduced in scale and density to align with the Deferred Residential framework, and protect the amenity, character and functioning of Leamington and Cambridge. • That full earthworks, stormwater, servicing and downstream effects be quantified and independently tested before any rezoning is considered.
262/3	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The plan change area is outside the Cambridge municipal water supply network. The applicant's servicing assessment indicates that if the Council did allow a connection from the plan change area to the network, there would only be enough capacity in the network to service the C5 area, but not the Rural zoned land. It is imprudent to live zone the Rural zoned land without confidence as to how it will be serviced with a reticulated drinking water supply. There are no public sewers servicing the plan change area. The applicant's servicing assessment says that only around 205 dwellings in the plan change area could discharge to the Leamington network without any network upgrades. Servicing later stages of the development will require construction of a new rising main.	We seek that Proposed Private Plan Change 37 be declined in full. In the alternative, if the Hearing Panel is not minded to decline the plan change entirely, we seek the following relief: • That all Rural zoned land outside the Deferred Residential framework in the District Plan be excluded from the rezoning. • That no rezoning or development proceed until core transport infrastructure is identified, funded and operational, including confirmed solutions for Cambridge river-crossing resilience and local network effects. • That no rezoning or development proceed until all necessary water supply and wastewater infrastructure is fully identified, funded, and operational for the scale of development proposed. • That the proposal be reduced in scale and density to align with the Deferred Residential framework, and protect the amenity, character and functioning of Leamington and Cambridge. • That full earthworks, stormwater, servicing and downstream effects be quantified and independently tested before any rezoning is considered.
263/4	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Is there really a need for this when Kelly Road, and Bridle ways have taken years to get off the ground. There is already development at the end of Lamb street/ Cambridge Road with two new subdivisions in place and some of those houses built have been on the market for over two years which would clearly signal that the local market are	To not approve this Plan change

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			not wanting to purchase these properties as they offer no additional infrastructure for families - you need to have a car to get anywhere, and public transport isn't great in Cambridge. Look to these subdivisions and you see the future problems. You only have to take a drive around to see its a slow process among the current housing developments and an additional 1500 homes in this area of beauty is just complete madness with no immediate demand. Its far more growth that what Cambridge needs or even wants at this stage.	
267/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	It is premature to permit of any new subdivisions in Cambridge and especially a subdivision of this scale, until the wide range of infrastructure and amenity development in Cambridge is planned and underway to support the existing size of Cambridge, the current subdivisions already underway not to mention the significant increase in population that this subdivision will create. For example: • Cambridge already needs a third bridge. Will a fourth to the south of town be needed as well. • Browning, Wordsworth and Shakespeare Street will be log jammed at rush hour to a greater extent than they are now. • Wordsworth Street has a cemetery, dog park , childrens playground and a sportsfield. It is hardly in keeping with the character of Cambridge to turn this road into a main thoroughfare. Schools, medical facilities, food supliers etc... need to be planned for.	Council should deny all aspects of the requested plan change application until such time as planning and development to support the current town is complete and the details of the planning to support these current plan change 37 have been provided to the ratepayers for consultation.
268/1	Neutral	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Although the economics assessment highlights that the potential benefits of bring forward post-2035 growth cells need to be balanced with the impacts on existing zoned/growth areas, as well as the costs associated with upgrading existing or constructing new infrastructure to accommodate growth, it does not adequately consider the effects of out of sequence and unanticipated growth including on Council's infrastructure investment in pre-2035 growth areas.	Further details and consideration (and/or a peer review of the Economic Assessment), including, but not limited to: • the appropriateness of advancing the C5 Growth Cell before other growth cells, • the effects on the pre-2035 growth cells, including Council's infrastructure investment in those locations and subsequent change to Development Contribution collection rates, from advancing the Structure Plan area • the risk of inadequate infrastructure capacity and the likelihood of reducing the committed infrastructure investment.
268/19	Neutral	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The Water and Wastewater Assessment identifies that wastewater will be conveyed via gravity pipes to a pump station(s), which will then discharge to the existing Leamington gravity network and ultimately to the Cambridge Wastewater Treatment Plant. Discharging 6 – 12 l/s of peak wet weather flow would require targeted upgrades to approximately 520m of pipe along Wordsworth Street and 250m along Burns Street, increasing diameters from 225mm to 300mm. These upgrades would be necessary to avoid surcharging and maintain a minimum 20% reserve capacity in the network.	The Structure Plan should identify that further wastewater modelling and detailed design is required at the subdivision stage to confirm staging, connection points, and any additional requirements that align with water sensitive design.
268/20	Neutral	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The timing of the wastewater upgrades will depend on the pace of development and actual flows generated. Given the unanticipated nature of development and burden of asset upgrades occurring earlier than planned, it is expected that the developer will be responsible for funding these works, consistent with Council policy for unanticipated or accelerated growth related infrastructure. The expectation that the developer will be responsible for funding the upgrades.	That the Structure Plan identifies that, in accordance with Council's policy for unanticipated or accelerated growth related infrastructure, all wastewater upgrades are to be funded by the developer(s).
268/3	Neutral	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The Economic Assessment relies on the development being cost-neutral to Council (based on the developer bearing direct infrastructure costs pre-2035) and any such costs will be formalised by way of an infrastructure Works Agreement. Accordingly, the details and agreement of infrastructure costs must be confirmed prior to the subdivision stage.	Confirmation of the expected infrastructure costs pre and post 2035, and that the Structure Plan Text is amended to identify that an Infrastructure Works Agreement or Private Developer Agreement ensuring cost neutrality to Council is required prior to the subdivision stage.
268/8	Neutral	Infrastructure & Sequencing	As the Structure Plan does not identify any indicative stage boundaries or internal water, stormwater or wastewater networks, Council is unable to determine whether the proposed three waters infrastructure upgrades are appropriate, efficient and timely.	That the Water & Wastewater Assessment and Stormwater Management Plan are updated to include the indicative stage boundaries or internal water, stormwater or wastewater networks, and the appropriateness, efficiency and timing of the three waters infrastructure solutions are considered. Infrastructure must be delivered prior to or concurrently with the stages of development that generate the demand for it. Or any other relief considered necessary and appropriate to address the issues raised by this submission.
268/9	Neutral	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The timing, staging and requirements relating to Pressure Reducing Valve (PRV) would need to be confirmed at the subdivision stage. Further modelling will be required to confirm the need for network upgrades, particularly if a looped connection to the bulk main is pursued.	That the Structure Plan is amended to identify the timing, staging and requirements of an PRV must be confirmed at the subdivision stage and that further modelling will be required to confirm the need for network upgrades.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
271/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	This proposal to rezone approximately 98.6 hectares for the Rider Park Structure Plan is premature, inappropriately scaled, and fails to adequately address the cumulative effects on the Cambridge community and infrastructure. The Council is bound by law to consider the collective wellbeing of the community. This proposal prioritises developer interests over the stability of our local infrastructure and the character of our town. I urge the Council to act on behalf of its residents and decline this proposal until such time as the town's infrastructure is actually ready to support it.	Decline Private Plan Change 37 in its entirety, or in the alternative, should the Council be minded to approve any part of the plan change, I seek that: It be deferred until such time as the "Third Bridge" and associated transport network upgrades are fully funded, consented, and operational.
271/2	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	The proposal is fundamentally premature. Cambridge is currently under extreme infrastructure pressure. Many residents, including myself, are concerned that existing roads, transport links, and local services are at a breaking point. It is irresponsible to approve a development of this magnitude, bringing forward growth intended for 2035 before a third bridge and wider network solutions are fully operational.	Decline Private Plan Change 37 in its entirety, or in the alternative, should the Council be minded to approve any part of the plan change, I seek that: it be deferred until such time as the "Third Bridge" and associated transport network upgrades are fully funded, consented, and operational.
272/2	Neutral	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Most importantly, increasing the population of Leamington by 40% will necessitate more infrastructure-particularly transit, roads, and schools. We need the bridge moved up and ideally taking truck traffic around Leamington rather than through.	Not specified
273/2	Neutral	Infrastructure & Servicing	The Waipā 2050 Growth Strategy and the Future Proof Future Development Strategy identify the Cambridge education network as an area expected to experience high levels of growth over the next 25 years, with approximately 75 per cent of that growth projected to occur north of the Waikato River. PC37 would add materially to this growth pressure. However, the Ministry currently owns only one school site south of the Waikato River, Leamington Primary School, which has limited capacity for further expansion PC37 proposes a large greenfield urban expansion that will generate demand for primary and secondary schools, early learning services, and safe walking, cycling and transport connections to education facilities. In this context, education infrastructure should be explicitly recognised as essential social infrastructure that must be planned for alongside residential development. The Ministry seeks the inclusion of clear enabling provisions for education facilities within PC37, including within Section 2A – Medium Density Residential Zone of the Waipā District Plan. While no specific site for a new school has been identified at this time, such provisions would ensure the plan can accommodate a school should the Ministry identify the need and location in the future. Enabling zoning provisions would: • Support the timely planning and delivery of education facilities in response to growth; • Avoid uncertainty or unnecessary consenting barriers at early stages of development; • Reinforce that schools and early learning services are anticipated and compatible activities within residential environments. Given the introduction of the Rider Park Structure Plan, it is also important that the structure plan framework explicitly recognises the potential need for future school sites and does not create land use patterns that would preclude or constrain future education designations should this be required. The Ministry's requested relief will support a future school (or schools) to be located in an appropriate location with suitable infrastructure in place to serve the surrounding residential catchments should the Ministry identify the need and location in the future.	The following relief and any consequential amendments required to give effect to the matters raised in this submission, including the following amendments to the Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone and Section 21 - Assessment Criteria of the Waipā District Plan: • Add a new objective 2A.3.8.1.a to read: *"to recognise and provide for schools and early learning services as essential community infrastructure necessary to support the rider Park Structure Plan Area"*. • Amend Policy 2A.3.8.2 to include *"education facilities"* as an example of an activity that provides for the health and well-being of the community and that service or support an identified local need • Amend Rule 2A.4.1.3 to add a new Restricted Discretionary Activity for *"Primary and Secondary Schools"* • Amend Discretionary Activity Rule 2A.4.1.4.d to refer to *"Other"* education facilities • Add new Restricted Discretionary Activity Assessment Criteria 21.1.2A.25.a to provide the following matters that Council discretion is restricted to include *"site planning and design, noise and operational effects, transport and access, infrastructure servicing, and safety and amenity.*
274/5	Neutral	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Section 9.11.1.1 of the plan change request provides an assessment against Policies UFD-P1 and UFD-P11 and Appendix APP13 of the WRPS/Proposed WRPS Change 1 – Decisions version. A number of other objectives, policies and methods of the Urban form and development chapter of the WRPS/Proposed WRPS Change 1 – Decisions version are also relevant to PPC37, including Objective UFD-O1 , Policies UFD-P2, UFD-P12 and UFD P13 (in relation to the proposed Neighbourhood Centres), Methods UFD M1, UFD-M2, UFD-M8, UFD-M11 and UFD-M49, and Appendix APP11. These provisions provide policy direction on important matters relevant to the proposed urban rezoning, such as integration of land use and infrastructure and achieving compact urban environments that support multi-modal transport options.	Ensure the proposed plan change is assessed against all relevant objectives, policies and methods of the WRPS and Proposed WRPS Change 1 – Decisions version.
276/1	Oppose	Infrastructure & Sequencing	Cambridge is not prepared to take on additional housing with it current infrastructure.	Get a third bridge in place first. Upgrade the current water facilities and drainage capacity before adding more strain on Cambridge

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Development Capacity

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
112/4	Support in Part	Development Capacity	The District Plan identified the original C5 growth cell as having a dwelling capacity of approximately 732 dwellings (at 61ha, pretty much all of it developable land). The Structure Plan for Rider Park aims to provide for a conceptual development capacity of at least 1,250 dwellings (at 98ha, of which a not insignificant portion is taken up by gully and river bank). That's an increase of roughly 60% of land, but more than 70% of housing.	Apply an increase in housing density in current growth zones where more significant amenities and transport options are already in place or worked on?
115/1	Support in Part	Development Capacity	We already have enough medium density in Leamington and Cambridge. Medium density development should be kept for within existing transport corridors and hubs. Less density on this side of the river and on the outskirts of town seems more appropriate due to existing transport/traffic congestion on arterial roads. Leamington and Cambridge are towns not a city.	Reduce density to min 600sqm lots and ensure road corridor widths are not reduced less than existing roads around Leamington.
177/4	Oppose	Development Capacity	The high density housing (Duplexs, Triplex, Quadplexes going up) that Cambridge has approved lately is already going to put strain on all of our amenities. Shakespeare Street as an example has 2 big buildings going up that's going to house 8 or more families (Just in one street). Cambridge is no longer the little old town I grew up in.	Not specified
188/1	Oppose	Development Capacity	Density is way too high	Reject proposed change
218/3	Oppose	Development Capacity	Although there are conflicting statements in the application and specialist reports regarding the quantum of proposed houses, we understand the additional houses to be in the vicinity of 1250. However, under the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS), the actual number of dwellings could be considerably higher. A substantial number of additional homes (double - 2500) could be built as permitted activities (cant be stopped), with further intensification possible through non-notified restricted discretionary resource consents. What assurance can the applicant give us that 1250 represents the maximum cap on residential development?	Decline the application.
225/8	Oppose	Development Capacity	I understand that approximately 1,250 dwellings are proposed. However, under the Medium Density Residential Standards, it seems possible that a significantly greater number of dwellings could be enabled as permitted activities, with further intensification through consent processes. This creates uncertainty as to the true scale of development. It is unclear to me what mechanisms would limit development to the stated yield of 1,250 dwellings. I am concerned that this figure may not represent a maximum cap, and that the actual scale of development and its associated effects could be considerably greater.	I oppose the proposed plan change
238/2	Oppose	Development Capacity	I am concerned that the number of houses that could ultimately be enabled by this plan change may be higher than the figure stated in the application materials and public communications, given the size of the land area and the MDRZ provisions. What assurance can the applicant provide to the community that 1,250 is the maximum number of additional dwellings that could result (now or in future stages)?	Decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37 (Rider Park Structure Plan). Alternatively, if Council is minded to approve all or part of the plan change, approve it only with whatever amendments, staging, and/or conditions Council considers appropriate to address the concerns raised in submissions and evidence (including any further information, assessment, or consultation Council considers necessary). Grant any other relief that Council considers appropriate and consistent with the purpose of the plan change process.
240/9	Support in Part	Development Capacity	Clarity is required around the proposed housing density, typology, and overall urban form. Understanding density is critical to assessing infrastructure demand, community amenity, transport impacts, and alignment with Cambridge's character	Provide clear detail on housing density, staging, and design outcomes, and how these integrate with the surrounding environment. • What density controls apply (minimums, maximums)? • How does this align with Medium Density Residential Zone intent and Cambridge character • What typologies are anticipated (standalone, terrace, apartments)?
241/8	Oppose	Development Capacity	Other wider factors that militate against the proposal include the excessive housing density and scale of the development compared to other developments and nearby housing areas in Leamington in particular.	That the proposed plan change be rejected
252/3	Oppose	Development Capacity	Our understanding is that not all developments have to be medium density. What percentage of Cambridge is required to be medium density? Has Council met its quota?	That Council does not proceed with this proposed plan change.
253/4	Oppose	Development Capacity	Key concern is how medium-density development will be expressed adjacent to existing low-density neighbourhoods, outside the established green belt. Wishes to understand: • Anticipated dwelling yields and housing typologies	That assurance be provided that: • Urban design outcomes are meaningfully guided by enforceable controls

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			• Building height, scale and site coverage • How transition zones between new and existing development are managed • Both macro and micro placemaking and urban design outcomes The implications of rezoning rural land and how this transition will be managed respectfully	• Amenity effects on neighbouring properties are appropriately avoided or mitigated Key parameters are not deferred to later stages without sufficient direction
256/3	Oppose	Development Capacity	The PC26, rezoning of the majority of the towns residential from Residential to Medium Density, has only relatively recently come fully operative. Redevelopment is occurring, and from what is evident to date, these offer a mix of forms, price points etc, and are already providing a lift to the immediate localities in which they are occurring. While this Medium Density zoning was put upon Council, it is here, and we must embrace this to ensure that the heart of Cambridge is updated and provides modern housing forms for the future. The Medium Density capacity that is being proposed on mass through this Private Plan change, can occur within the township, within the 10-12 year timeframe indicated for proposed Ryder Park, or already suitably zoned land.	Reject this plan change to ensure that Cambridge does not end up with a hollow core, and urban sprawl.
257/2	Oppose	Development Capacity	we understand the additional houses to be in the vicinity of 1250. Under the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS), the actual number of dwellings could be considerably higher. A substantial number of additional homes (double - 2500) could be built as permitted activities (cant be stopped), with further intensification possible through non-notified restricted discretionary resource consents. Has these additional houses been contemplated, particularly in relation to traffic effects?	Decline
262/4	Oppose	Development Capacity	The proposed zoning would be Medium Density Residential across a very large area, with proposed densities of 25 dwellings per hectare. Our concern is that this proposal would enable an overly intensive, high-turnover urban form at the edge of Leamington before the necessary transport and servicing framework is in place. That creates a serious risk of substandard amenity outcomes, overloaded local streets, loss of openness, noise and disruption over many years, and gradual erosion of the small town character, green edge and distinctive feel that make Cambridge and Leamington attractive in the first place. Poor integration between the plan change area and its surroundings could result in fragmented development, potentially foreclosing future options for the rational development of the neighbouring C5 land (including our own) or creating adverse interface effects for existing rural properties.	We seek that Proposed Private Plan Change 37 be declined in full. In the alternative, if the Hearing Panel is not minded to decline the plan change entirely, we seek the following relief: • That all Rural zoned land outside the Deferred Residential framework in the District Plan be excluded from the rezoning. • That no rezoning or development proceed until core transport infrastructure is identified, funded and operational, including confirmed solutions for Cambridge river-crossing resilience and local network effects. • That no rezoning or development proceed until all necessary water supply and wastewater infrastructure is fully identified, funded, and operational for the scale of development proposed. • That the proposal be reduced in scale and density to align with the Deferred Residential framework, and protect the amenity, character and functioning of Leamington and Cambridge. • That full earthworks, stormwater, servicing and downstream effects be quantified and independently tested before any rezoning is considered.
268/2	Neutral	Development Capacity	While the Economic Assessment identifies that the Structure Plan has the potential to lower residential land prices / increase housing affordability, the assessment relies on increasing the supply of residential capacity, neither the Economic Assessment or Structure Plan identify specific measures or outcomes sought in relation to the provision of affordable housing.	That affordable housing measures beyond increasing residential capacity are considered and that the Structure Plan is amended to identify and ensure housing affordability outcomes.
268/51	Neutral	Development Capacity	New Rule 15.4.2.1B – Average Dwelling Density • While the rule attempts to address density targets, the outcome would not guarantee a dwelling density of 25/ha is achieved. If a subdivision application did not meet 25 dwelling/ha, there would be no relevant standard for the PC37 area under Rule 15.4.2.1. Adding minimum and average net lot areas under Rule 15.4.2.1 would be consistent how the District Plan currently controls density, more likely to achieve the intended density and could be relied upon at the time of subdivision.	That New Rule 15.4.2.1B is deleted and new minimum and average net lot size standards for the PC37 area are added into Rule 15.4.2.1. Or any other relief considered necessary and appropriate to address the issues raised by this submission.
269/3	Oppose	Development Capacity	Overlay of all of development in Cambridge 11 to 14 lots per ha. This development says 25. Allowing for roading/berms/plantings etc this can assume that lot sizes will be around 200 to 300m^2 maximum. Cambridge largely to date has vast majority of lot sizes ranging from 500 to 1000m^2. People need to be aware of the intensity planned. Go and have a look at the intensity of these developments. Is this development being planned well with associated infrastructure and town planning to be able to deal with this density?	To oppose PC37

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Business Land

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
124/3	Oppose	Business Land	The proposal introduces a large volume of new housing but provides only limited neighbourhood-scale commercial activity. While neighbourhood centres are included, their scale and function are modest. They are unlikely to significantly reduce the need for residents to travel elsewhere for employment, retail, services and daily needs. This reinforces an existing pattern in Cambridge, where residents travel across the river for work and services, placing ongoing pressure on key transport routes and bridge crossings. The proposal includes only limited neighbourhood-scale commercial activity and does not demonstrate how a significant proportion of daily trips will be contained within Leamington. Without this, the development is likely to reinforce, rather than reduce, existing cross-river travel demand. There is insufficient evidence that land use planning has been aligned with transport outcomes in a way that reduces demand, rather than simply accommodating it.	Reassess the scale and function of commercial and mixed-use areas within the development. Provide for greater local employment and service provision within Leamington. Demonstrate how the proposal will reduce, rather than reinforce, cross-river travel demand.
205/2	Oppose in Part	Business Land	The proposal assumes ongoing reliance on the Cambridge and Leamington town Centres for employment, retail and services. These centres are already under pressure in terms of traffic flow and parking. There is no assessment of whether existing public parking supply has the capacity to accommodate the additional demand generated by 1250 dwellings. The proposed neighbourhood centres do not address that issue. They are unlikely to materially reduce reliance on those centres for broader employment, retail, hospitality, professional services, medical services or other wider commercial needs. The effect is that demand will continue to be directed into already constrained areas. The material provided does not assess whether Cambridge and Leamington town Centres have the capacity to absorb additional demand generated by this development. That includes traffic movements, parking demand and general network pressure within the Town Centre environments.	I therefore seek that the plan change be declined unless and until Council is satisfied that the wider Cambridge and Leamington transport network can accommodate the cumulative effects of the development. In the alternative • the plan change should be deferred or subject to staging controls linked to wider transport network performance, not just local intersection upgrades and water infrastructure. • Any approval should require an updated section 32 evaluation that properly assesses the transport-related costs and risks of proceeding before wider infrastructure constraints are resolved.
218/2	Oppose	Business Land	To establish well-functioning communities, residential development must be supported by an adequate supply of commercially zoned land. This does not appear to have been sufficiently addressed. Carter's Flat is the only new commercial area identified in Cambridge; however, given its historical use as an industrial area, there will be delays in transitioning the zone to commercial use. This is further compounded by the high cost of industrial-zoned land in Hautapu.	Decline the application.
225/7	Oppose	Business Land	Establishing well-functioning communities requires residential development to be supported by an adequate supply of commercially zoned land. It is unclear whether this has been sufficiently addressed. I understand that the National Policy Statement on Urban Development seeks to achieve well functioning urban environments. In my opinion, this requires residential growth to be supported by sufficient business land and services. I am not convinced that this proposal demonstrates how that outcome will be achieved, particularly given the reliance on a single future commercial area.	I oppose the proposed plan change
235/2	Oppose	Business Land	There is plenty of evidence that Cambridge has grown to the extent that there is a severe lack of parking in the town centre, the population has grown beyond the commercial capacity of the retail centre.	I seek that Council decline this plan change, and any other early opening of planned residential areas until such time as provision of additional parking in the commercial areas is addressed and commercial capacity of the town centre is increased in general and the lack of decent Supermarket Space is dealt with.
241/7	Oppose	Business Land	The scale of the proposed development has seriously harmful implications for the very nature and character of Cambridge. Parking in the CBD is already at a premium with ongoing frustration from all sectors about the adverse effect that has. The scale of the proposed development will amplify those concerns and problems especially as there are few or no places where additional parking can be provided and the absence of reliable, frequent and reasonably priced bus service exacerbates the problems	That the proposed plan change be rejected
249/3	Support in Part	Business Land	Leamington has a level of day-to-day retail and domestic services, however these are being stretched with the substantial population increase. Where does Council anticipate finding additional land, suitable for rezoning to allow the growth of retail and health services in line with Leamington's population growth. The plan includes neighbourhood services, however this does not make provision for the larger commercial requirements of a population of this size or cater for commercial or health services of any scale requiring adjacent road parking.	Not specified

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
257/6	Oppose	Business Land	In order to establish well-functioning communities, which is a core principal of the National Policy Statement, Urban Development, residential development needs to be supported by a supply of commercial zoned land. This does not appear to have been adequately addressed. Carter's Flat is the only new commercial zoned area identified in the District Plan, however given its primary use has historically been industrial, there will be delays in transforming this zone to commercial, which is compounded by the price of industrial zoned land in Hautapu.	Decline
261/5	Oppose	Business Land	Cambridge town centre and major supermarkets (including Woolworths and New World) already experience peak-time congestion. Increased residential growth without corresponding retail or supermarket expansion risks further strain on supply chains, parking, and overall customer experience. Weekend visitor congestion already places pressure on town centre infrastructure, and adding further residents and visitors will only increase this, to the point where it risks becoming an unpleasant experience for both residents and visitors.	To consider the following points in relation to this plan change: • That careful consideration is given to whether advancing the proposed plan change ahead of its original staging timeframe is appropriate at this time • That further assessment is undertaken of the cumulative effects of existing and already consented developments across Cambridge before additional large-scale rezoning is progressed. • That infrastructure capacity (including transport, water, wastewater, healthcare, education, and community services) continues to be closely considered alongside growth, to help ensure it remains aligned over time. • That a staged and coordinated approach to growth continues to be maintained where possible, in order to support the ongoing liveability, character, and service levels of Cambridge.
268/49	Neutral	Business Land	New Rule 2A.4.2.69 – Neighbourhood Centres • At 1.25ha each, the proposed neighbourhood centres could be too large and have effects on existing commercial centres. • While the minimum 3m wide verandah requirement 2A.4.2.69(d) would be consistent with existing Commercial Zone standard, it does not provide for a 0.5m setback from the road kerb.	Consideration as to whether two neighbourhood centres up to 1.25ha each are appropriate to service the PC37 area. That Rule 2A.4.2.69(d) is amended to be consistent with the existing District Plan Commercial Zone verandah design standards. Or any other relief considered necessary and appropriate to address the issues raised by this submission.

Waikato River Access

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
238/5	Oppose	Waikato River Access	I am also unclear why only a narrow strip of land is shown adjoining the Waikato River. Based on my familiarity with the topography in the adjoining reserve, this may largely be steep embankment and may not be sufficient for a usable public walkway. This seems inconsistent with recent subdivisions on Addison Street where a wider (approximately 20 m) esplanade area has provided a valued public pathway separating the river from private properties, which I and other community members regularly use.	Decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37 (Rider Park Structure Plan). Alternatively, if Council is minded to approve all or part of the plan change, approve it only with whatever amendments, staging, and/or conditions Council considers appropriate to address the concerns raised in submissions and evidence (including any further information, assessment, or consultation Council considers necessary). Grant any other relief that Council considers appropriate and consistent with the purpose of the plan change process.
268/27	Neutral	Waikato River Access	The proposed Indicative Local Purpose Reserve along the Waikato River covers the area of existing vegetation and steep river bank. Accordingly, the proposed reserve area would not enable public access along the river and be inconsistent District Plan objectives 15.3.12 and 15.3.13.	The proposed Indicative Local Purpose Reserve along the Waikato River should be extended to the 20m Geotechnical Setback to enable public access along the river.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Open Space

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
268/22	Neutral	Open Space	While the Structure Plan Image shows several Indicative Local Purpose Reserves and the AEE identifies that "Pivotal to the establishment of local identity, community cohesion and connectivity is the establishment of open spaces" and subsequent resource consent applications may also include additional reserves to supplement the open space network, it is important that sufficient recreation reserves to serve the future population of at least 1,250 dwellings are identified at this stage.	Consideration as to whether the number, size and location of reserves proposed are sufficient.
268/23	Neutral	Open Space	There is insufficient certainty as to the responsibilities, costs and obligations for Council in relation to accepting the proposed Indicative Local Purpose Reserves, particularly the central gully space which is proposed to be restored and would require ongoing maintenance by Council.	Confirmation of the responsibilities, costs and obligations for Council in relation to accepting the proposed Indicative Local Purpose Reserves.
268/26	Neutral	Open Space	That the Structure Plan Image should identify the purpose and indicative location of all proposed reserves within the site.	That the Structure Plan Image is amended to confirm the purpose and indicative location of all proposed reserves.

Reverse Sensitivity

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
155/3	Oppose	Reverse Sensitivity	I am concerned about reverse sensitivity effects. New medium-density residents may find the noise and activity levels of the Leamington Domain/Wordsworth Park a nuisance, leading to future restrictions on the park's use. The plan lacks adequate "buffer zones" to protect the park's operation.	Decline Private Plan Change 37 in its current form. Alternatively: Require the developer to provide larger buffer zones to protect the Leamington Domain from reverse sensitivity.
161/1	Support in Part	Reverse Sensitivity	This 25m buffer was mitigation promoted to the Leamington Rugby Sports Club in an email dated 22 May 2023. The Club sees this buffer as important for managing any potential reverse sensitivity effects, partially in relation to existing and probable future lighting to meet future requirements.	The Club reserves the right to alter its neutral position if the proposed 25m buffer strip is removed or altered from the plan change.
172/3	Oppose	Reverse Sensitivity	The rugby club could also be affected, due to their necessity to use lights at night for their training, which might seen as a nuisance to the bordering houses.	To not let this submission go ahead
173/2	Oppose	Reverse Sensitivity	The rugby club could also be affected, due to their necessity to use lights at night for their training, which might seen as a nuisance to the bordering houses.	Not specified
198/2	Oppose	Reverse Sensitivity	I am also a member of the Leamington Sports Club and can see housing clashing with our activity	Stop this subdivision and look after the trees around town instead
228/4	Oppose	Reverse Sensitivity	The land adjoining the proposed development is also currently used for rural productive purposes. Therefore, adding in a large housing estate adjacent to such activities could result in reverse sensitivity effects.	I am seeking council to not allow the proposed changes to be approved
232/2	Oppose	Reverse Sensitivity	The Rural zoning of the Cambridge Golf Club and the land within the immediate surrounding area contributes to the overall player experience and amenity of Cambridge Golf Course. The proposal to rezone approximately 52.89 hectares of Rural Zoned land to Medium Density Residential Zone and the establishment of a residential area in this location has the potential to significantly impact the potential for the Golf Club to expand in the future.	That Waipa District Council reject the Proposed Plan Change unless and until all of the following are addressed: • Covenants being registered on the titles of the land within the Proposed Plan Change that is currently zoned Rural Zone in the Waipa District Plan which is located north of the Deferred Residential Zone (and is proposed to be rezoned) that prevent the current and future owners and occupiers of the aforementioned land from lodging complaints or submissions in opposition to the recreation and function related activities and development at the Cambridge Golf Club site (including future development); and • Consent Notices being registered on the titles of the land within the Proposed Plan Change that is currently zoned Rural Zone in the Waipa District Plan which is located north of the Deferred Residential Zone (and is proposed to be rezoned) - duplicating the wording set out in the above Covenants. Alternatively, if Council is not mindful to accept the Proposed Plan Change subject to the above amendments and relief sought, Cambridge Golf Club request that the Proposed Plan Change be rejected in relation to the Rual Zoned land north of the Deferred Residential Zone.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
270/2	Oppose	Reverse Sensitivity	The rural sector is facing increasing issues with reverse sensitivity as more people move into productive areas with unrealistic expectations about the activities involved in primary production. PC37 has assessed reverse sensitivity effects by stating that dwellings are not constructed up against the boundary adjoining rural zoned land by relying on a 5m setback. Dwellings would be constructed with acoustic treatments. The application is relying on LIMs and Sales and Purchase Agreements to implement these measures. Having acoustic treatments for dwellings does not manage those effects on people who are outside making use of outdoor living space where there are lawful rural activities occurring adjacent to the property.	Federated Farmers does not support Plan Change 37. However, if the Council were to grant the plan change; • reverse sensitivity covenants should be registered on the titles to manage reverse sensitivity effects by stating that lawful rural activities can occur on adjoining land that may give rise to noise and odour within permitted activity thresholds of the district and regional plans. Covenants also draw attention for future buyers who are not the original owners that there are lawful rural activities occurring on adjacent land. • an appropriate buffer strip between residential lots and adjoining rural land is implemented on those adjoining titles or a strip of land is taken and vested in council as local purpose.
69/3	Oppose	Reverse Sensitivity	Reverse Sensitivity: I am concerned about reverse sensitivity effects. New medium-density residents may find the noise and activity levels of the Leamington Domain/Wordsworth Park a nuisance, leading to future restrictions on the park's use. The plan lacks adequate "buffer zones" to protect the park's operation.	I seek that the Council decline Private Plan Change 37 in its current form. Alternatively, I seek the following amendments and conditions: Site Redesign: Require the developer to provide larger buffer zones to protect the Leamington Domain from reverse sensitivity.
91/7	Oppose	Reverse Sensitivity	Cambridge is internationally celebrated as the "Equine Capital" of New Zealand. The Rider Park site (currently Milan Park Stud) is part of a critical cluster of equine properties that support a multi-million dollar industry. Industry Fragmentation: Pushing high-density housing into the heart of the equine belt creates land use conflicts (noise, dust, and traffic) that make it difficult for remaining stud farms to operate.	I seek that the Waipa District Council decline Private Plan Change 37 in its entirety.

Traffic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
4/1	Support in Part	Traffic	I am in town regularly for school and work and consider the chokehold of traffic at peak hour to be heavy. Another 1000+ homes would increase this even further, considerations around this need to be implemented.	• Add an offramp at the south end of Cambridge off SH1 so Leamington traffic does not need to go through Cambridge East. • Another bridge to avoid traffic build up through the town centre Another high school
5/2	Oppose	Traffic	Traffic management issues in Leamington/Cambridge have not adequately been addressed by Council and this proposal will only escalate the problems already being faced within our community.	To decline this proposal and maintain the zoning as deferred residential until existing issues associated with population growth are addressed.
6/2	Oppose	Traffic	The extra traffic the subdivision will create	To not allow this subdivision
8/3	Oppose	Traffic	I am very opposed to this. Would make Leamington even more of a traffic jam at peak times.	That council do not rezone this land.
11/3	Oppose	Traffic	The traffic also would be crazy – it already is when rowing at lake and any event there. Shakespeare Street is already backed up to the shops in the morning commute. Should this be considered, then a staged approach over 20 years in line with the other projects for bridge etc…	Please do not proceed with this proposal.
13/1	Oppose	Traffic	Leamington cannot sustain the increase in traffic. The two bridges are not enough as it is. We live on Browning St, the noise from the traffic (trucks and farm tractors) is already horrendous.	Reject this plan outright.
17/1	Support in Part	Traffic	Wary of the effects of this increased population on the traffic in Leamington. There is already often noticeable nose to tail traffic and people making dangerous merges at the Wordsworth/Shakespeare intersection. The same can also be said for the Campbell / Shakespeare intersection.	A plan of how this will effect traffic. I believe another roundabout on Shakespeare would help relieve this.
19/1	Oppose	Traffic	The infrastructure of Cambridge roads is already at maximum capacity. I would like to see a solution to easing traffic congestion before the town grows any more. Parking in town is near impossible to quickly pick something up.	Improve infrastructure to connect Leamington and Cambridge before any further developments are consented.
21/1	Oppose	Traffic	The increase in traffic and how Council intend to cope with it. You can't have more housing/population on the east side of Cambridge without a third bridge	A positive decision on a third bridge. A feasibility study on the installation of Gondolas for public transport.
26/1	Oppose	Traffic	Roading in and out of Leamington is already under a lot of pressure, there is significant build up of traffic daily across the bridges during start of work, end of work and school drops/pick ups. I understand the logic of more properties bringing more rates/revenue to pay for bridges etc, but the traffic is already at a horrendous level and this amount of extra houses will lead to absolute gridlock.	Delay of extra subdivisions in Leamington until traffic has been brought under control through an Extra bridge or upgrade of low bridge and a north bound on/off ramp onto the expressway next to the golf course
28/1	Oppose	Traffic	Town Infrastructure is already suffering with the growth of the town. Parking is very limited and traffic congestion is increasing at a rapid growth rate.	Object to Plan Change #37

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
30/1	Support in Part	Traffic	The number of houses impacting already stretched resource. Before that many more houses are built there needs to be provision for the increased traffic down Shakespeare St - flow improvements and safety around the centre. That's potentially 1200 more cars in the morning and evening peak traffic.	I would like to know what considerations the council have given to these areas
47/1	Oppose	Traffic	I oppose the development due to the added pressure on the Browning -Shakespeare St intersection and both the high and low level bridges.	To prevent the development of Milian Park stud.
53/1	Oppose	Traffic	The ability for Leamington to cope with the additional people and vehicles the proposed subdivision will create.	To put this subdivision on hold until at least 2030 when suitable roading is in place.
55/2	Oppose	Traffic	The addition of more homes in Leamington will exacerbate an already severe traffic congestion problem in Leamington and Cambridge. The two bridges across the Waikato River are bottlenecks which barely cope at peak times now, and the high bridge is over a hundred years old and must be reaching the end of its useful life. I have lived in this town since 1997 and witnessed the worsening gridlock each time one of the bridges is closed for repair. We desperately need more bridges and this has been discussed endlessly but never actioned.	Reject completely Proposed Private Plan Change 37 - Rider Park Structure Plan and rezone the land to Rural.
56/2	Oppose	Traffic	Traffic and road safety: The proposed development will significantly increase traffic volumes in and around Leamington. Current road networks are not designed to accommodate this level of growth, and there is a lack of clear, funded commitments to necessary upgrades. This raises concerns about congestion, safety, and accessibility. Shakespeare Road is especially getting busier and busier, there will need to be roundabouts put in to make it safe for people to turn on to the main road.	Primary relief: Decline Private Plan Change 37 in its current form. Alternative relief (if the plan change is approved in some form): • Introduce explicit staging provisions that prevent development from proceeding until roading upgrades are completed and proven sufficient • Require a comprehensive, integrated transport plan, including funded upgrades, prior to development. ▪ Amend the structure plan to provide improved connectivity with existing Leamington areas,
57/1	Support in Part	Traffic	Before anymore plans are made to add housing in Leamington a 3rd bridge needs to be up and running; and an onramp at the golf course end of the motorway. Traffic congestion is already high, a 5 minute journey often takes 25-30 minutes if an event is on. There is no parking, making it difficult to shop local these day, we often go out of town which is a shame.	Council amend the Rider Park Structure Plan to ensure that: • roading and transport infrastructure is upgraded to safely accommodate increased traffic, particularly around the Leamington peak times. • That Council require comprehensive traffic assessments and implement appropriate mitigation measures (such as a 3rd bridge, safe intersections, pedestrian crossings, and traffic calming) prior to further development. Alternatively, that the plan change be declined or deferred until these infrastructure and service capacity issues are appropriately addressed.
58/1	Support in Part	Traffic	I am really happy for Leamington to continue developing but have MASSIVE reservations that relevant infrastructure will be provided in advance. • There is just no way of accessing the expressway easily as it is. • We need to travel either through the main street via the high level bridge, or wind our way through crazy traffic via the low level bridge, or take your life in your hands negotiating the intersection of Lamb and Cambridge road. • The roading is already gridlocked and will put huge pressure on vehicles moving past Leamington primary or the t-intersection with Shakespeare. It feels like all of the facilities are built geared towards people on the Cambridge side, and Leamington is very much the poor cousin.	That there needs to be a massive investment in the Roads/Bridges and facilities in Leamington in advance of this development happening. A commitment from Council and the developers to make sure that a new bridge is created, and an onramp above the golf course to access the expressway and eliminate the town gridlock.
59/1	Oppose	Traffic	Building this number of new residential homes would be totally unacceptable given current levels of traffic in Leamington and Cambridge. We simply do not have the infrastructure in place to support this - not least of all roading. • The High Level bridge connecting Leamington and Cambridge could never cope with the influx of vehicles this development would inevitably bring. • Parking in Leamington and Cambridge is already congested and this would drive more shoppers to the big Hamilton Malls.	Reject the application

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
60/1	Oppose	Traffic	I submit in opposition to aspects of PC37, particularly as they relate to scale and timing relative to provision of essential infrastructure. Whilst I acknowledge the need for housing and urban development within Waipa, the current proposal does not adequately align growth with the capacity of critical infrastructure. This creates significant risks for existing and future residents. Key constraints are transport infrastructure. • Existing local and arterial routes are already under pressure. • A development of this size will exacerbate congestion, particularly during peak hours. • The lack of a committed and funded third bridge severely limits network resilience and capacity. • Current crossings are already bottlenecks. • There is also inadequate provision for additional on and off ramps on and off SH1. This will also lead to increased congestion. Increased traffic volumes without corresponding upgrades will result in a higher accident risk.	I request that PC 37 is delayed until infrastructure capability is sufficient. Require binding infrastructure triggers like a third bridge, key road corridors and additional motorway access points, new schools, medical facilities and retail amenities. I urge Council to adopt a more cautious, infrastructure-led approach under PC 37
67/1	Support in Part	Traffic	I am assuming that the infrastructure will be in place to support such a subdivision. I am concerned about the impact on Leamington: • we already have huge trucks going along Pope Terrace and Shakespeare Street plus traffic from Karapiro and Lamb Street subdivisions. • 30 years is too long to wait for a new bridge if we are going to substantially increase the population around Leamington. Careful consideration needs to be given to bringing the proposed date of a new bridge forward by 20 years at least. The roundabout on the Leamington side of the High Bridge has already been identified as dangerous, what will it be like if another couple of thousand people live on this side?	Bring the planning of a new bridge forward by 20 years or stop approving new large subdivisions on the Leamington side of the Waikato River.
69/1	Oppose	Traffic	Cumulative Transport Impact: The Integrated Traffic Assessment (ITA) fails to adequately account for the cumulative impact of PC37 alongside other growth cells. It does not solve the bottleneck at the Shakespeare Street/Leamington bridge route. Without a third bridge or significant arterial upgrades, this development will bring the Leamington transport network to a standstill. Traffic & Pedestrian Safety: Wordsworth Street serves a "destination park" (Leamington Domain). An increase in vehicle movements creates a direct safety risk for families. The current parking layout at Wordsworth Park is already difficult to exit; funnelling more traffic onto these suburban streets is poor urban planning.	I seek that the Council decline Private Plan Change 37 in its current form. Alternatively, I seek the following amendments and conditions: • Traffic Mitigation: Require a funded upgrade to the Leamington roading network and a committed solution for bridge capacity before any development stages are approved. • Safety & Access: Conduct a revised Traffic Impact Assessment that specifically accounts for the safety of park users on Wordsworth Street. • Implement physical traffic calming and improve exit visibility for the Wordsworth Park parking area. Require the developer to redesign site exits to avoid funnelling traffic onto already clogged suburban side streets
71/1	Oppose	Traffic	I oppose this plan, particularly the rural aspect to medium density residential zone. This area should be kept as rural due to the amount of traffic the new subdivisions will create. The proposed development: • will create greater traffic congestion over the two main access points into Cambridge (High and Low level bridges). Currently there is considerable traffic on the main Wordsworth and Shakespeare Roads at peak times of day, both in and out of the township. There is a small primary school within this area (Leamington primary) and many young people are walking or cycling to and from school. Extra traffic creates a safety concern for many parents.	I seek the 52.89ha or Rural Zone to remain rural and not be changed to medium density residential zone
74/1	Oppose	Traffic	Cambridge town does not have adequate utilities and roading to support the new 1000+ houses on the plan change. There is already significant traffic pressure on the Shakespeare road entry to town (with the bridge) and it is one of only two bridges roading options coming the south and one of two roading options from the east (Whitehall and Te Miro). This creates a choke point that is already strained and can deadlock when traffic is bad.	The council should not approve the changes to the plan to allow more residential zoning unless additional roading and utilities into Cambridge from the South are made available.
78/1	Support in Part	Traffic	There is no footpath at present at the end of Wordsworth St going towards the cemetery and dog exercise park. I use this regularly and have to walk on the road especially when it is wet. This footpath needs to be completed before any development takes place-even opening the extension into the new area. The intersections of Wordsworth will have to be improved before any construction takes place There is already pressure and if lights are installed at the intersection how does it work in with the already congested roundabout further East.	That the overall community and Council decisions on the development of roading and third bridge be decided and coordinated before the Plan change be allowed to proceed.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
79/1	Oppose	Traffic	Our two bridges are constantly jammed, and it doesn't take much to bring the whole town to a standstill. Another 1,250 homes can only make this worse without infrastructure to handle this amount of growth. People need to get around efficiently and safely. Until the bridges get major upgrades or a new bridge is built approving a development this large will worsen congestion and safety leaving us all to deal with the consequences.	The current bridge and commuting infrastructure issues be fully resolved and fully implemented and working successfully before any development commences.
82/1	Oppose	Traffic	I am deeply concerned by the impact on our current roading infrastructure by more housing. How would the potential residents of this new housing zone get to and from their homes? Can the Browning St / Shakespeare St intersection cope with this increased traffic at peak times? What would the impact on the traffic flow down Shakespeare St toward the bridges be at peak times? Do we need another bridge? How will these new residents get on and off the Expressway? Will they need to go through the CBD if they are heading north and what would be the impact of this increased traffic?	I would like the council to decline this current request until robust, evidence based information is sought by the current landowner and communicated to the current ratepayers for a second round of submissions if the landowner wishes to resubmit at that point
88/1	Oppose	Traffic	Cambridge already experiences significant traffic congestion, particularly during peak morning and afternoon hours. Traffic moving between Cambridge and Leamington is often gridlocked, largely because there are only two bridges available to cross the Waikato River. These bridges are already operating beyond comfortable capacity, and any incidents or peak-hour surges cause widespread delays across the town. The proposed development would add a substantial number of additional residents and vehicles, which would further increase traffic volumes on an already constrained network. Without the provision of a third bridge linking Cambridge and Leamington, this development would significantly worsen congestion, travel times, and road safety for existing residents. Approving such a large development before critical transport improvements are in place would negatively affect the quality of life for current residents and would represent poor long-term planning outcomes for Cambridge.	That Waipā District Council declines Private Plan Change 37 as notified. Alternatively, if Council is minded to approve the plan change, I seek that it be deferred or substantially amended to include clear, binding requirements that a third bridge crossing between Cambridge and Leamington is fully planned, funded, and constructed prior to, or concurrent with, any large-scale residential development. Without these requirements, the plan change should not proceed.
91/2	Oppose	Traffic	Bridge Congestion: Cambridge already suffers from significant bottlenecks at the existing bridge crossings. This development will exacerbate peak-hour gridlock, affecting all Cambridge residents.	I seek that the Waipa District Council decline Private Plan Change 37 in its entirety. If the Council is minded to approve any part of the plan, I seek that the density be significantly reduced to Low Density Residential (matching the existing Leamington character) and that all development be delayed until the scheduled 2035 timeframe to allow for proper infrastructure integration.
91/5	Oppose	Traffic	School Safety: As a father of four children (aged 9, 7, 4, and 18 months), I am particularly concerned about the safety of our local school zones. The increased traffic through Leamington will significantly elevate the risk for children walking or cycling to Leamington Primary and other local schools. The roading hierarchy in this area was never designed to absorb the traffic of a high-density urban satellite	I seek that the Waipa District Council decline Private Plan Change 37 in its entirety. If the Council is minded to approve any part of the plan, I seek that the density be significantly reduced to Low Density Residential (matching the existing Leamington character) and that all development be delayed until the scheduled 2035 timeframe to allow for proper infrastructure integration.
92/1	Oppose	Traffic	I oppose the proposed subdivision. Wordsworth Street (main connector road) already experiences safety issues due to the destination playground, which has no allocated parking. Visitors park on the grass verge, creating limited visibility for the drivers reversing onto the busy road. The use of the park increases during summer and winter months with sporting activities taking place. Street lighting along this road is inadequate, further reducing visibility during early morning and evening hours. While the Council recommends that visitors walk or cycle to the playground, in practice most families drive, and the assumption that all users will travel by foot or bike is unrealistic. The proposed subdivision will increase traffic volume on this road, exacerbating existing safety hazards for drivers and children playing at the park. The speed of traffic is already a significant issue on this road. The installment of lights for traffic management will ease the movement of traffic on to Shakespeare street but does not adequately demonstrate how the surrounding roading network can safely accommodate additional traffic, nor does it address the combined effects of informal parking, limited visibility and poor street lighting. I consider these are significant adverse effects on road safety, amenity and the surrounding environment that have not been sufficiently mitigated. The traffic accident report that has been provided by Boffa Miskall is also incorrect - we have recordings on our home security cameras of two further accidents on Wordsworth Street directly outside out property that have not been taken into account in their stats	I seek that the application for the proposed subdivision be declined, on the basis that it will exacerbate existing safety issues on the main connector road. In the alternative, if the council is minded to grant consent, I request that no decision be made until further traffic and safety assessment is provided that specifically addresses: • Informal playground/roadside parking and associated visibility risks. • Street lighting adequacy. • Pedestrian and child safety, • Mitigation measures, including possible road and intersection upgrades to roads that join the connector road - before any dwellings are occupied.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
95/2	Oppose	Traffic	Environmental issues that cause more pressure on local infrastructures and natural resources. • Increase in heavy traffic/ cars causing air and noise pollution. • Increased traffic coming over the two bridges ,one that is over a 100 years old. • congestion driving when in Cambridge already a bottle neck, limited parking. I feel that Council are doing the tick box on asking our views but it will be already decided .	Do not build on the land. How many more estates can we have in Cambridge
99/1	Oppose	Traffic	The associated transport and infrastructure provisions, including reliance on existing Leamington and Cambridge road networks, assumed adequacy of existing Waikato River bridge crossings, staged infrastructure delivery reliant on future agreements rather than completed works, the distance to secondary schooling is already significant, and the journey involves navigating congested roads and limited safe crossing points, increased traffic volumes resulting from this plan change will exacerbate safety risks, particularly for children walking, cycling, or being driven to school. The absence of explicit plan provisions requiring: • Additional Waikato River bridge connections or capacity upgrades. • Fully funded and delivered transport infrastructure prior to development impacts. • Integration with wider regional transport systems, including Hamilton–Auckland road, airport, and rail networks. The plan change also fails to adequately consider wider transport connectivity, including: • Safe and efficient access to Hamilton and Auckland airports. • Regional road resilience for employment, education, and health access. Future rail opportunities for commuters and students.	Decline PC37 as currently drafted; or require substantial amendments to ensure that: • Additional Waikato River bridge connections or capacity upgrades are explicitly provided for. • All transport, three-waters, and associated infrastructure required by the development is fully funded and delivered by the landowner and developer. • Infrastructure is completed to or concurrent with development, not deferred. • Safe school travel, child safety, and peak-time congestion are explicitly addressed. The development is demonstrably integrated with regional transport systems, including airport and rail connectivity.
103/2	Support in Part	Traffic	The road system to the site is not adequate to cope with the number of vehicles in the subdivision. The 2 bridges that service Cambridge at present are not adequate. The roads that lead to those bridges are often heavily congested. The suburban roads such as Kingsley where we live are not suitable or adequate for increased traffic volumes.	A cohesive and detailed road network plan is required before the development is confirmed. It is not acceptable to suggest a 'plan is in development' whilst the development is in motion.
106/1	Support in Part	Traffic	I wish to be advised of proposed traffic management plan for Browning/Maungatauri intersection. Will there be traffic lights, what protections for pedestrians crossing the intersection. What speed limits will be applied?	That the application only go ahead when the safety and peace of Browning St residents is considered and actioned.
108/3	Oppose	Traffic	The extra traffic will also have a negative impact on the Leamington Village, which is already too busy/noisy at peak times and furthermore, has inadequate parking for the businesses that operate there.	That the proposal in its entirety, be denied and that the status quo remains.
113/2	Oppose	Traffic	Traffic congestion is already a serious and documented concern for residents in and around the Cambridge area. The local and arterial roading network is experiencing significant peak-hour pressure, with congestion affecting access, amenity, safety, and the quality of life for existing residents. approving this rezoning without first undertaking a comprehensive traffic impact assessment and committing to the infrastructure improvements identified therein would be irresponsible and contrary to the sustainable management purpose of the Act.	Decline the proposed plan change to rezone the Rider Park Structure Plan area to medium density residential in its current form; OR • Defer any decision on the rezoning until a comprehensive infrastructure capacity assessment has been completed, published, and consulted upon; and • Commission an independent traffic impact assessment of the proposed rezoning, with findings made publicly available prior to any decision being made; and • Commit to a published infrastructure investment plan that prioritises addressing existing deficiencies before enabling further residential intensification in the area.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
118/1	Support in Part	Traffic	There will need to be a roundabout at Wordsworth/Shakespeare St intersection as it is already a problem area. There would need to be a third bridge to cater for the extra traffic.	The developer to address these issues.
119/1	Support in Part	Traffic	We disagree with this plan because of the increased traffic volume it will create along Wordsworth Street. It is already a busy road and also has extra traffic for the local children's play park, netball courts and the camping ground. Also the road is very noisy when traffic travels along it with the particular choice of road surface.	To oppose the plan in it's current form.
123/2	Oppose	Traffic	The traffic at peak times is already crazy, and 1200+ homes, probably one, two or even more cars is only going to make it worse. I strongly oppose the development	I seek this proposal to be denied.
124/1	Oppose	Traffic	Effects on local residential streets. The transport assessment takes a network-level view and concludes that the overall system will operate within capacity. However, this does not adequately address effects at a local level. The proposal relies heavily on Wordsworth Street during early stages of development, while also acknowledging existing pressure at the Wordsworth Street / Shakespeare Street intersection. In practice, this creates a strong likelihood that drivers will seek alternative routes to avoid delays. For nearby residential streets such as Chaucer Street, this raises concerns about: • Increased traffic volumes • Rat-running and shortcutting behaviour • Reduced safety and residential amenity. The assessment relies on a network-level assumption that traffic will disperse. However, no evidence is provided of street-level modelling or assessment of driver behaviour in response to congestion. In the absence of this, it cannot be concluded that adverse effects on local residential streets will be no more than minor. There is also no clear identification of: • Mitigation measures to protect local streets • Monitoring of traffic effects beyond key intersections Triggers for intervention if adverse effects arise	Require further assessment of traffic effects on local residential streets, including Chaucer Street. Require evidence addressing rat-running and traffic redistribution, not just arterial and collector road performance Include measures to protect residential streets, such as traffic calming, filtering, or other design responses. Require a monitoring and response framework, with clear thresholds for intervention.
124/2	Oppose	Traffic	The proposal includes upgrades to key intersections, including signalisation of the Wordsworth Street / Shakespeare Street intersection. However, these upgrades are tied to development thresholds rather than delivered in advance. While this approach may manage long-term network capacity, it does not adequately address the interim effects experienced by existing residents. During staging, a substantial number of dwellings may rely on constrained parts of the network before upgrades are in place. This creates a period where: • Congestion is likely to increase • Local streets are more susceptible to overflow traffic • Effects are experienced ahead of mitigation While infrastructure upgrades are proposed, these are triggered by development thresholds rather than delivered in advance. This approach manages long-term capacity but does not adequately address the interim effects experienced by existing residents during staging.	Require that key upgrades, particularly at Wordsworth Street / Shakespeare Street, are delivered before significant development occurs Review staging provisions to avoid extended periods where large numbers of dwellings rely on constrained infrastructure.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			I support well-planned growth. However, in its current form, the proposal demonstrates that the network can accommodate additional traffic in technical terms, but does not demonstrate that the effects of that growth will be acceptable at a local or community level.	
127/2	Support in Part	Traffic	As a previous resident of Browning St, I have seen how backed up traffic can get at the intersection with Shakespeare. This is particularly bad when there are major events on at lake Karapiro. This is mainly due to the right turn across a busy road to head towards Cambridge town. The intersections of both Browning and Wordsworth St with Shakespeare would get significantly busier due to this change.	Considerations of traffic flows at key intersections given the large number of additional people likely moving through key pinch points.
128/1	Oppose	Traffic	While I understand the need for housing development, I believe this proposal is premature and could worsen existing issues in our community. My main concerns are: • Traffic congestion on Shakespeare Street: - The current traffic flow is already strained, especially during peak hours. - Increased density without infrastructure improvements will likely lead to even greater congestion, impacting residents' safety and quality of life. • Inadequate road maintenance. - The existing roads are poorly maintained, with potholes and insufficient signage. - Expanding residential areas without upgrading infrastructure will only worsen these problems. • Limited and aging bridge infrastructure: - There are only two bridges connecting Leamington to Cambridge. - The High Level Bridge, which cannot support heavy trucks, is aging and susceptible to closures for maintenance or safety reasons. - Relying heavily on this bridge could lead to significant disruptions if closures occur unexpectedly. People need a new bridge that will be able spread the heavy vehicles and extra traffic more efficiently than the normal bottle neck points which is getting worst and not just peak hours too.	That Council: • prioritise upgrading current infrastructure—such as road maintenance and bridge safety—before proceeding with rezoning plans that could place additional strain on our transport network. • takes appropriate action to ensure the safety and well-being of all residents. For the plan not to go ahead till the current problems to roads and bridges are up to the increased traffic.
131/1	Support in Part	Traffic	I am not opposed to new developments, but this particular plan will create traffic nightmares for Leamington residents. Shakespeare Street is already gridlocked during rush hours so adding a potential 1200+ extra cars will be a future nightmare. Council needs to concentrate on building a third bridge for Cambridge before they consider a development of this size. I am not opposed to a smaller development of 200 to 300 houses going ahead until a new Bridge is built.	Reconsider the size of the development. Push ahead with plans for a new Bridge.
134/1	Oppose	Traffic	The current traffic situation on Wordsworth Street is already problematic, with no give way or stop signs and frequent speeding. Crossing Shakespeare Street at most times of the day is challenging and dangerous, especially for pedestrians and cyclists. With an estimated 2.8 cars per household, the increased density will exacerbate these issues, making it even more difficult to navigate our streets safely. Moreover, I am particularly concerned about the increased traffic along Browning Street, especially with more cars and cyclists sharing the road. My grandchildren attend Leamington Primary, and I worry about their safety as traffic increases. The existing traffic infrastructure is under strain, and the introduction of additional residents will only worsen congestion. A third bridge or alternative traffic solutions are essential to ensure safe and efficient travel, particularly for families commuting to school and work.	I oppose the whole subdivision
136/1	Oppose	Traffic	Traffic in Cambridge is already a real and ongoing frustration for many of us. At peak times, it can be extremely difficult just to get across town. Without a third bridge or major roading improvements, I cannot see how our town can possibly cope with the scale of this proposed development. The thought of adding significantly more vehicles to already congested roads is overwhelming. It will impact how we get to work, how our children get to school, and overall safety in our community.	reconsider this plan change and put the needs of the current community first. Traffic Management Plan and consideration of on and off ramps both ways.
142/1	Oppose	Traffic	I would like to know how if this goes ahead will Shakespeare st cope with the influx of vehicles to the road. It is already a bottle neck onto Shakespeare st at work and school busy times.	If there is not any improvements to the structure prior to the first house been built, then I would expect my rates to decrease.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
143/1	Oppose	Traffic	Please do not allow this change to affect the future of Cambridge/ Leamington through increased pressure on roading, especially in the rural area and surrounding streets. The bridges are at capacity during peak hours	No provisions / leave the farmland as is
145/2	Oppose	Traffic	The traffic management system recently enlarged the existing roundabout at Cook Street/Shakespeare Street which has caused major congestion in peak time traffic. The result of which has caused various 'rat runs' one of which is from Kingsley Street through Chaucer Street. There is a local Kindergarten in Kingsley Street. The speed limit is 50 km/hr but currently vehicles are ignoring the limit. Kingsley Street and Chaucer Street would be two of the main access roads connecting to Wordsworth Street.	That Council do not proceed with the implementation of Private Plan Change 37 - Rider Park Structure Plan
148/1	Support in Part	Traffic	The timing of wider transport network changes need to be addressed before this development begins. I am specifically concerned about current peak congestion in other parts of Cambridge (Victoria St from Motorway through to town centre and across the two current bridges), which have the potential to significantly swell with the addition of 800+ dwellings in Leamington. I make this based on an assumption of a higher percentage of residents travelling to/from the motorway and needing to transit across these already constrained points.	Decision to support the development but subject to current traffic management "choke points" being resolved first
150/1	Oppose	Traffic	Up to 1250 homes means 2500+ cars needing to access this development. There would be a heavy reliance on Wordsworth Street and Browning Street. I can foresee huge problems exiting Tennyson Street at either end and even if lights were installed to control traffic flow at pinch points, this would cause traffic to be backed up blocking more streets. There would be years of construction and truck movements, causing congestion which is already becoming an issue in Leamington.	Reject the application for Private Plan Change 37 Rider Park
152/2	Oppose	Traffic	Leamington already experiences traffic difficulties especially trying to move from side streets into Shakespeare St due to the flow from Browning and this proposal will increase that. The volume of trucks down Browning and into Shakespeare has increased over the last 12-24 months increasing the noise and this development will only increase this. There are issues in Pope Tce I am also advised. The Council: • already knows of these issues and has some plans to address these which raises the question when you know you have a problem would you not solve it before you increase pressures? • (I believe) will have already received funding from developers and yet apart from cycleways and speed humps (along with changing and restricting traffic flows in some areas) seems to have done nothing to improve the already known congestion issues. The lack of clear decisive long-term planning has resulted in housing development going ahead and restricting the bridges' possible locations. Will PC37 do the same?	Take stock - decide what Cambridge and Leamington are aiming to become.
153/2	Oppose	Traffic	When the expressway was developed, we were left with no off / off ramp heading north, trucks still need to bypass town, those travelling to Hamilton, still need to go through town. Adding 52 ha of residential land is only going to add to the existing traffic effects that haven't been dealt with.	To reject the change to the plan, we do not need further subdivisions at this stage
154/1	Oppose	Traffic	The proposed development will materially affect the local, already congested roading infrastructure, in particular the 'low level' bridge both during construction activities and should the development proceed the increased residential traffic will gridlock the Leamington Community.	Decline the submission
155/2	Oppose	Traffic	The Integrated Traffic Assessment (ITA) fails to adequately account for the cumulative impact of PC37 alongside other growth cells. It does not solve the bottleneck at the Shakespeare Street/Leamington bridge route. Without a third bridge or significant arterial upgrades, this development will bring the Leamington transport network to a standstill. Wordsworth Street serves a "destination park" (Leamington Domain). An increase in vehicle movements creates a direct safety risk for families. The current parking layout at Wordsworth Park is already difficult to exit; funnelling more traffic onto these suburban streets is poor urban planning.	Decline Private Plan Change 37 in its current form. Alternatively: • require a funded upgrade to the Leamington roading network and a committed solution for bridge capacity before any development stages are approved. • Conduct a revised Traffic Impact Assessment that specifically accounts for the safety of park users on Wordsworth Street. Implement physical traffic calming and improve exit visibility for the Wordsworth Park parking area. • Require the developer to redesign site exits to avoid funnelling traffic onto already clogged suburban side streets

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
156/1	Oppose	Traffic	I live on Browning Street - the main route from Karapiro into Leamington and onwards to Cambridge. Traffic along Browning Street is constant and frequently has tail backs. Browning and Shakespeare Streets frequently overloaded without adding more traffic. Leamington has a 40km zone - some drivers adhere to it, but others not. During opening hours there is a mixture of cars, trucks, buses, pedestrians all navigating driveways, bus stops, car parks, service and leisure businesses. Additional traffic from a new subdivision is going to negatively impact current infrastructure and further add to congestion. Further out along Maungatautari Road Lake Karapiro regularly hosts regional, national events whish run over several days, many run over a week. Traffic coming and going to these events is constant and further creates banks of traffic on Browning Street, all turning into Shakespeare Street. Takāpoto estate now adds to congestion. Both places hold events that require significant support crews towing a variety of water craft / horse floats. There are only 2 pedestrian crossings on Shakespeare / Browning Street - one poorly marked. Into the mix a lot of heavy traffic there are children walking / scootering and having to use the crossings. I can observe the Browning Street crossing and note the frequent lack of notice trucks, in particular give to pedestrians. There is no school facilities where the proposed development is to take place. Movement to access schools / facilities would largely come one way into consistently busy thoroughfares.	Not specified
158/1	Oppose	Traffic	There is more congestion on all streets in Cambridge now without adding to it. There is no parking in town now without adding it now.	Not specified
159/1	Oppose	Traffic	Leamington is grossly underserved by its lack of bridges and having one main thoroughfare - Shakespeare Street. Traffic is frequently queued and gridlocked from the low bridge to the Leamington medical centre. Access through Wordsworth Street will make this even worse.	Defer the plan for a new subdivision until there is another bridge and another access like Shakespeare Street.
162/1	Oppose	Traffic	The proposed housing development will place further strain on roading infrastructure before major transport upgrades are in place. e.g. a 3rd bridge and a northern entry/exit onto the Waikato Expressway from Tirau Road, allowance for extra traffic is needed before rezoning land on the Leamington side of the river.	To reject Private Plan Change 37-Rider Park Structure Plan
162/3	Oppose	Traffic	Wordsworth Street and the surrounding streets already experience traffic congestion, especially over the winter months when netball courts and rugby fields are operating, adding another 1250 residences to the area will only exacerbate existing traffic congestion and compromise road safety in an already busy area. Extra traffic created by this development will also add to existing congestion at the Wordsworth / Shakespeare St intersection, the Shakespeare roundabout, Cook St & both bridges and add to existing traffic "rat running" down Churcher and Kingsley Streets (past a local kindergarten) to avoid congestion at the Shakespeare roundabout.	To reject Private Plan Change 37-Rider Park Structure Plan
164/3	Oppose	Traffic	Likely effects for nearby residents - More congestion on roads already under pressure.	To oppose the housing development. The Cambridge infrastructure needs development before anything like this.
168/1	Oppose	Traffic	The current roading constraints between Leamington and Cambridge Township with two bridges does not support the growth in population density from an additional 1200 homes proposed as a result of this plan change.	Commitment and a committed timeline for a third-bridge over the Waikato River linking Leamington and Cambridge township before development of this subdivision occurs.
170/2	Oppose	Traffic	This is the main road to Lake Karapiro, where there are too many events to count and most days we are have vehicles filing pass, another 1000 plus residents with their cars will be hard to imagine. This is also one of the routes that many primary school children walk and bike to Leamington Primary this would make it a very unsafe road for them to continue to use.	I would like the subdivision to be put on hold until correct infrastructure has been put in place and all these concerns have been addressed.
171/1	Oppose	Traffic	Cambridge is not prepared for this type of growth until our infrastructure is sorted. The biggest concern is traffic that will add to our already congested streets.	A third bridge is a MUST and would be a solution to this. More roundabouts and traffic light could be also a solution
174/1	Oppose	Traffic	I don’t think our town is prepared for the increase of 1250 households. The main concern is the traffic issue between Leamington and Cambridge. We already need the third bridge and I think we need one before we go ahead with this. Our public transport is not at the level it needs to be to accommodate this. If we had constant buses etc going from Leamington to all around Cambridge (or just for busy periods) this would be great but we just haven’t got it yet.	Add in a new bridge or find a solution to the extra traffic this will cause
175/1	Oppose	Traffic	No more residential developments, without the necessary upgrading of roading and bridges!	Do not approve this plan.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
176/4	Oppose	Traffic	The reports claim that the increase in traffic around the area is within defined boundaries and manageable on an arterial road, any commuter or resident of the Leamington / Maungatautari Road area would likely disagree. The regular increase in Maungatautari Road during events at Karapiro seems unaccounted for, along with the probably through traffic (via the dam from Maungatautari Road) that will result from the Karapiro Edge development already underway at Karapiro Village.	We ask Council to retain the deferred development of the C5 growth cell until 2035 and not allow the remainder of the property to be rezoned from rural to medium density residential.
177/1	Oppose	Traffic	I do not think this should go ahead due to the already busy Browning Street - The road is already busy, 100s of trucks already drive this road on a daily basis plus the added pressure from events, the corner of Shakespeare Street and Browning Street is already a bottle neck. People Fly around the swooping corner and there is a pedestrian crossing that is unsafe. The Congestion in Cambridge for a "small town" is unbelievable. Getting from Leamington to the Expressway takes 15-20 minutes already. The line at Shakespeare street round about at 8am can back up to NPD on a good day.	I think the subdivision should be put on hold until infrastructure has been improved. I believe a bridge at the south end of the expressway into Leamington is needed before more subdivisions.
178/5	Oppose	Traffic	Wordsworth Street, Carlyle Street, and Maungatautari Road are key routes for cyclists and are heavily used by children walking or cycling to school. Increased traffic movements, particularly those funnelling toward Shakespeare Street, heighten the risk to these vulnerable road users.	That the Council decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37 as notified, or substantially amend it to address the matters raised in this submission before any approval is considered. It is unclear what specific road safety upgrades will be implemented, including intersections, pedestrian crossings, speed management measures, and cycling infrastructure. These must be planned and delivered prior to development, not retrofitted once issues arise.
180/2	Oppose	Traffic	More traffic without more alternative river crossings means increased road usage (which drives to increased road works needed for repairs), noise (further disrupting peaceful living and sleep), and hazards to children. Not to mention that slow moving traffic will get significantly worse at rush hour times, adding to pollution to the air and likely result in drivers making sketchier decisions on the road (leading to more road accidents).	Decline the proposal in its current state and, at minimum, add condition that a portion of monetary proceeds from any potential land development be put towards an additional river crossing to service the growth.
182/1	Oppose	Traffic	Adding extra residents to Leamington will put a huge amount of extra traffic heading through Cambridge either via Victoria Bridge or Ferguson Bridge. It will increase volumes heading to Hamilton and returning at the end of a work day, putting more pressure on residents trying to get through town. It will also, as a flow on effect, slow down Emergency services trying to navigate at peak times.	Please do not vote in favour of this plan change, and leave the land as is.
184/1	Oppose	Traffic	The Integrated Transportation Assessment (ITA) contains a couple critical limitations that underestimate the potential adverse traffic effects on the Leamington and Cambridge community: • **Outdated/Skewed Baseline Data**: The baseline traffic counts (e.g., at Shakespeare/Wordsworth Street) were collected in November 2022 (ITA Footnotes 10, 11, 13). This period was shortly after the COVID 19 pandemic restrictions, where traffic patterns (e.g., work-from-home rates) had not normalized. Using 2022 data likely underestimates the true "normal" baseline traffic, meaning the forecasted Level of Service (LOS) and intersection capacities are overly optimistic. **Uncertainty of the River Crossing Bottleneck**: The ITA acknowledges the river crossings as known constraints. However, the "Cambridge Connections" project (which included a potential third bridge) is currently "reset" (Section 3.6.2). Adding ~1,250 dwellings to Leamington without a confirmed solution for the river crossing will severely exacerbate existing traffic bottlenecks during peak hours.	Declines the Rider Park Private Plan Change UNLESS the following decisions/amendments are made: • Require an Updated Traffic Assessment: Mandate the applicant to conduct new baseline traffic counts using current 2025/2026 data to replace the 2022 pandemic-era data, and re-run the intersection Level of Service (LOS) models to reflect true current traffic volumes. • Link Development Staging to the 'Cambridge Connections' Project: Introduce strict staging rules that cap the maximum number of dwellings allowed in the C5 Growth Cell until the Waipa District Council formally confirms and funds the solution for the Cambridge river crossing (e.g., the third bridge). • Dynamic Network Monitoring: Instead of relying on static dwelling numbers for staging triggers, the Private Developer Agreement (PDA) must include mandatory "Real-world Traffic Audits". Further stages should only be released if actual intersection performance remains at LOS D or better.
185/1	Oppose	Traffic	Cambridge infrastructure is currently insufficient for the current zoning resulting in traffic congestion on a daily basis. I request that Council place an immediate embargo on any further land-zoning changes until essential infrastructure upgrades have been completed. I suggest the additional bridge and access to the Waikato expressway heading north from the lower bridge are essential improvements prior to the plan change.	Decline the zone change.
186/1	Oppose	Traffic	Cambridge infrastructure is currently insufficient for the current zoning resulting in traffic congestion on a daily basis. I request that Council place an immediate embargo on any further land-zoning changes until essential infrastructure upgrades have been completed. I suggest the additional bridge and access to the Waikato expressway heading north from the lower bridge are essential improvements prior to the plan change.	Decline the zone change.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
187/1	Oppose	Traffic	I request that Council place an immediate embargo on any further land-zoning changes until essential infrastructure upgrades have been completed. I suggest the additional bridge and access to the Waikato expressway heading north from the lower bridge are essential improvements prior to the plan change.	Decline the zone change.
189/1	Oppose	Traffic	Cambridge infrastructure is currently insufficient for the current zoning resulting in traffic congestion on a daily basis. I request that Council place an immediate embargo on any further land-zoning changes until essential infrastructure upgrades have been completed. I suggest the additional bridge and access to the Waikato expressway heading north from the lower bridge are essential improvements prior to the plan change.	Decline the zone change
190/2	Oppose	Traffic	It is becoming increasingly difficult to utilize the goods and services in the town because of a lack of parking and in the case of the Dr's a month long wait for an appointment. The traffic along along Shakespreare Street at 8am in the morning doubles my journey to work from Roto O Rangi to Karapiro School and I have to leave earlier and earlier to ensure I arrive in my classroom on time.	That they deny the change of plan 37 and maintain the status quo: the 98 hectares on the southeastern side of Leamington should remain as a rural zone for agricultural enterprises.
191/2	Oppose	Traffic	The traffic assessment relies on what can only be described as tertiary upgrades (i.e. traffic lights on Shakespeare Street and another connection further north) which would just add to the problems already facing anyone who lives on the south side of the river.	Reject the application for the private plan change so generations of family's can continue to live and enjoy the amenity that currently exits. Keep the growth within the current plan area
192/1	Support in Part	Traffic	While standard concerns regarding inconvenience, noise, dust, general road congestion etc from any new development would apply to this project, our immediate and prime concern is the potential for the Council and developer to force a change to Addison Street where our home is situated.	Assurance from the developer and Council that Addison Street will remain in its current state i.e. a quiet residential street and not a main throughway to the new development.
192/3	Oppose	Traffic	A secondary concern is access to Shakespeare Street from Addison Street. It is currently a bottleneck and, with traffic coming from the new development, access will be impossible.	Assurance from the developer and Council that Addison Street will remain in its current state i.e. a quiet residential street and not a main throughway to the new development.
193/2	Oppose	Traffic	Any intersection onto Shakespeare will become a major issue with the increased traffic. It is already difficult to turn right out of most of these streets with the current traffic at most times of the day and especially peak rush hour times.	Whole proposal to be on hold until a new bridge is constructed over the Waikato river and the roading and infrastructure is ready to accommodate the proposed growth.
193/3	Oppose	Traffic	The number of trucks on our roads (through Leamington) have been destroying the roads at an alarming rate and causing more traffic issues. With more traffic added to this issue, Leamington will further lose its quiet small town charm and we will instead be caught in constant road works and traffic jams.	Whole proposal to be on hold until a new bridge is constructed over the Waikato river and the roading and infrastructure is ready to accommodate the proposed growth.
193/4	Oppose	Traffic	You have only considered the developments on the traffic entering the main routes but not how it will impact on the surrounding residential areas and roads. It will stop movement out of our roads onto Shakespeare Street and increase risk as people may have to hasty decisions to move out onto the main street. We already see this happening now, it will only get worse if the proposed development goes ahead.	Whole proposal to be on hold until a new bridge is constructed over the Waikato river and the roading and infrastructure is ready to accommodate the proposed growth.
195/2	Oppose	Traffic	Traffic is difficult at the best of times let alone the extra trucks/construction. Dust /noise will become a problem let alone the extra wear and tear on existing roads/bridges. It will destroy the feeling of Cambridge township	A deferment of said housing plans till the roads/bridges are sorted along with the infrastructure
196/1	Oppose	Traffic	The impacts of the proposal specifically on the residents of Wordsworth St and generally on the infrastructure of Cambridge.	That the Council rejects the proposed Plan Change
197/1	Oppose	Traffic	Development of a further 1250 dwellings and this Rider Park Structure plan should not progress at this time. Current infrastructure in Leamington will not tolerate the increase in traffic associated with a plan. Already, there are significant bottlenecks in traffic at the Shakespeare Roundabout, the high bridge and the low bridge. Further population will increase stress on this system. This is more alarming in light of an aging Victoria St Bridge that has an expiry due date within a decade	I seek council to postpone development until such a time that the traffic infrastructure can better support an increase in population. This would most likely look like a third bridge installation.
198/1	Oppose	Traffic	Leamington does not have the infrastructure to support this growth and only two bridges are also already causing a problem so adding this number of cars is ridiculous.	Stop this subdivision and look after the trees around town instead
199/3	Oppose	Traffic	The pressure is constant on all the main roads feeding in and out of town: Shakespeare Street, Cambridge Road, Victoria Road, Norfolk Drive and Robinson Street. Not to mention all the suburban side roads. The wait times to get onto either bridge in the mornings gets longer and longer and traffic is queued along Victoria and Hamilton roads every day at peak times. Traveling north twice a week at 10am, the queues coming into town are always long.	We seek to request the Council declines the application for the plan change affecting the 52.89 hectares currently designated rural - and that the land remains designated rural.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
200/1	Oppose	Traffic	The proposed subdivision will have two ways in and out, one being Wordsworth Street. This will significantly increase traffic on a residential street with a well used children's playground. Most traffic entering and exiting the subdivision will add to the existing congestion on Shakespeare Street and further increase the need for a third bridge across the river. Until some practical solutions are found to address the existing problems getting into and around Leamington, I cannot support any proposal that would significantly worsen the problems.	To refuse the plan change to medium density housing for this land. To require alternate plans for access and facilities in the subdivision before any plan changes or planning permission is considered
202/5	Oppose	Traffic	There is already heavy traffic on this side of Leamington making it almost impossible to cross Shakespeare street in the morning due to traffic flow. The high and low bridges are heavy congested and will not cope with thousands more cars per day. The road leading from Mangatautari Road / Lamb street is a dangerous intersection poorly designed and is a feeder street into the Leamington primary school. This road also leads into the Pukekura subdivision which also has a dangerous poorly designed entry point.	The Council should not approve this change to plan due to safety concerns with roading and lack of supporting infrastructure including schools and bridges.
203/1	Oppose	Traffic	Cambridge is already under infrastructure pressure. (Getting into and out of our Street in particular is risky and time consuming unnecessarily at peak times of the day). Carters flat is also a disaster area for traffic flow.	No, this development & private plan change 37 cannot go ahead.
203/4	Oppose	Traffic	Traffic effects will be significant and existing roads are already under pressure.	No, this development & private plan change 37 cannot go ahead
204/1	Oppose	Traffic	Living where we do we need to turn onto the lower end of Shakespeare Street to go left to Leamington or right into Cambridge. At some times of the day it becomes almost impossible to make a right turn as traffic volume is to great. I can only imagine how it will be with another 1250 houses added to the mix. As these houses would be built some distance out of town then each house would probably own two cars at least. Without a third bridge, Shakespeare Street will be a continuous stream of traffic. Parking has become almost impossible in town, imagine another possible 2,500 cars!	Not allow building consent for further development at Ryder Park. Decline plan change 37 - Ryder Park
205/1	Oppose in Part	Traffic	I oppose the plan change in its current form on the basis that it does not adequately assess or address the consequences for the wider transport network and the Cambridge and Leamington town centres. The proposal will add significant vehicle movements into a network that already depends on heavily constrained bridge access, limited SH1 access and town centre roads that are routinely congested. Those are known constraints. The assessment provided does not adequately engage with that reality. The broader question is whether the wider Cambridge and Leamington transport network can accommodate the cumulative aspects of this growth. On the material provided, that question is not answered. There is no meaningful assessment of the additional demand placed on the river crossings, the Cambridge town centre network, or access to State Highway 1. These are the points at which congestion is already experienced. they are also the points through which this development must inevitably connect. There is no capacity or staging considerations for the transport network beyond the immediate site. There is no mechanism that ties development to the capacity or performance of the wider network.	I therefore seek that the plan change be declined unless and until Council is satisfied that the wider Cambridge and Leamington transport network can accommodate the cumulative effects of the development. In the alternative • the plan change should be deferred or subject to staging controls linked to wider transport network performance, not just local intersection upgrades and water infrastructure. • Any approval should require an updated section 32 evaluation that properly assesses the transport-related costs and risks of proceeding before wider infrastructure constraints are resolved.
206/2	Oppose	Traffic	Appendix 7, section 7.7 of the application notes that an estimated 18% of the traffic volume will use the Lamb Street / Maungatautari Road intersection. The underdeveloped nature of the southern end of Lamb Street already creates safety issues (following the development of Pukekura Park), and this subdivision will exacerbate this issue.	I request the council declines to rezone this land as proposed.
207/1	Oppose	Traffic	Feeder roads for access to local shops, services, and schools would mostly exit into Shakespeare Street. This street is busy at all hours and the surface is already in need of maintenance. It is NOT SUITABLE to carry the huge increase and consequent congestion of traffic generated by the proposed new subdivision. It is simply not feasible for this amount of traffic to move into Cambridge township using the limited river crossings. Another bridge might alleviate the congestion, but that will not happen soon enough to allow for this Plan. Further, vehicles wishing to travel north or to exit from north on the Expressway would have to travel through Cambridge township, thus adding intolerably to the congestion already experienced at the various roundabouts (viz at the bottom of Shakespeare Street, at the Town Hall, and at St Andrew's Church) and to the residential areas.	Do not allow any part of this Proposed Plan Change to go ahead.
208/1	Oppose	Traffic	The traffic going along Kingsley St, will very likely be greatly increased. Already it is used by many as a by-pass route to Maungatautari Road. There is a kindergarten on Kingsley St, where multiple children are dropped off or picked up alongside the Kindy. With increased traffic the chances of an incident happening would be highly likely. Vehicle noise along Kingsley St would increase dramatically.	Not specified

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
209/1	Oppose	Traffic	Leamington infrastructure is not ready for development at this scale, traffic effects will be significant and existing roads are already under pressure. If you are planning on putting 1200 sections how will the roads coming from this cope.	To ban this subdivision at the scale that it is.
210/1	Oppose	Traffic	The proposed subdivision is extremely high density and exits on to an already busy rural road. This road also supports traffic to various events at the Karapiro Domain. There is no secondary route that could be considered as being able to support this extra traffic - most homes in today's times have at least 2 vehicles, sometimes more. Current wait times at the Browning St / Shakespeare St intersection already cause concern to those using it. The current infrastructure of Cambridge is not advanced enough to cope with the large number of dwellings proposed and I do not believe that sufficient further planning for upgrades have been advanced.	That this subdivision be NOT allowed to proceed
210/2	Oppose	Traffic	The bike/walking path from Leamington out to Lake Karapiro is a much used and much loved pathway. Many families use this as a safe and quiet pathway for learning to bike safely. The entry/exit for this new subdivision will create a very unsafe area for all using this pathway.	That this subdivision be NOT allowed to proceed
212/2	Support in Part	Traffic	I am concerned about the traffic congestion on the corner of Browning and Shakespeare Sts and all other intersections up and down Shakespeare St to Ferguson Bridge.	A clear decision on intersections with the increased traffic flows. Present roading problems attended to
213/2	Oppose	Traffic	We submit that there will be an unreasonable increase in traffic on Maungatautari Rd and at the intersection of Browning and Shakespeare Streets and in Leamington and the Village generally. Twelve hundred and fifty houses mean a minimum of two and a half thousand cars, which will mean the low bridge and high bridge out of Leamington will be beyond capacity. As there are no plans yet for a third bridge river crossing this is excessive. Even if this is developed in stages it will still have the same final effect on our community.	The council to deny permission for this development to go ahead in any form
213/3	Oppose	Traffic	Major events at Lake Karapiro already regularly dominate our suburb of Leamington. Traffic from this proposed development will further exacerbate traffic and noise.	The council to deny permission for this development to go ahead in any form
214/3	Oppose	Traffic	We have observed the extra cars in some of the new subdivisions and there are often more cars due to some of the properties having multiple people living there. Leamington is already so congested and Saturday when kids are playing sport is so difficult to get out onto the main road.	Oppose
215/3	Oppose	Traffic	The submitters are directly affected by the proposed southern access via Maungatautari Road. The introduction of a roundabout and primary access point to a large residential development will materially alter the function of the road and create increased traffic volumes, turning movements and congestion, safety risks at existing intersections (including Lamb Street) and increased noise, lighting, and disruption. As properties located directly opposite the proposed southern access, these effects will be experienced at the submitters' boundary from the outset of development. These are not minor or temporary effects, but immediate and ongoing changes to traffic movement, safety, and the overall function of the road environment.	Decline the plan change in its current form; or Alternatively, require that development: • addresses safety issues at key intersections prior to development thresholds • includes measures to mitigate effects on directly affected properties, particularly along Maungatautari Road • recognises that the submitters' properties are located directly opposite the proposed southern access and requires specific, site-responsive mitigation measures to address frontage-level effects, including traffic, safety, noise, lighting, and visual impacts from the outset of development.
216/2	Oppose	Traffic	Traffic is impossible currently, the new PC development will not ease it but add to the problem.	To consider existing residents and rate payers like myself, the impact it will have. To discard the entire PC. That is a simple and only request.
217/2	Oppose	Traffic	Traffic flow and parking are now major concerns. NZers like their cars and the majority of households own multiple vehicles. My road Hamilton Road heading to or from the White Church has traffic levels now that might exceed what it was pre-Expressway! Granted there are less heavy truck movements, but recent sand quarry permissions will be changing that.	Reject this application and do not make the plan change 37.
218/4	Oppose	Traffic	The ITA does not appear to have taken into account the MDRZ zoning; which is significantly different to the standard 'residential zone' provisions which were likely relevant when this assessment was done. Has the roading network been properly modelled to reflect the full development capacity enabled under MDRS? This is a fundamental issue that must be addressed.	Decline the application.
218/5	Oppose	Traffic	Traffic congestion is already a concern and will be significantly worsened by this proposal. What specific measures are being put in place to ensure children and families can safely cross Shakespeare Street on their way to school and or town centre? At present, it is very difficult to safely cross Shakespeare Street (unless there is a specific pedestrian crossing that requires cars to stop and give way). Personally, as residents of Addison Street, it is very difficult to safely cross Shakespeare Street and feels really unsafe walking into town via Achilles Ave as the bridge	Decline the application.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			is so narrow and there is a lot of traffic (often driving very quickly). Going the other way (Cook Street) takes too long and there are still issues with safe pedestrian crossings.	
218/6	Oppose	Traffic	Turning right into Shakespeare Street (via Addison Street) is unsafe and difficult, during most hours of the day. Considering Council's Roading departments stance and resistance for new vehicle crossing created as part of innocuous resource consent applications, we can't understand how increasing traffic movements, on an already congested street, represents a functional and safe option; despite the mitigation measures suggested by the traffic engineer. The introduction of traffic lights at Wordsworth/Shakespeare Street is likely to exacerbate congestion rather than resolve it.	Decline the application.
218/7	Oppose	Traffic	We request absolute certainty (beyond all doubt) that a future connector road will not be established at the end of Addison Street. This must be formally embedded in the District Plan as a Prohibited Activity in order to preserve the natural character of the street, particularly as a key part of the green belt.	Decline the application.
220/2	Support in Part	Traffic	The Leamington park area on Wordsworth street, which is highlighted in the transport assessment on page 16, figure 3-12. I have concerns around the roadside edge of this structure being used as parking. It is already very precarious driving along Wordsworth St in this area, with many small children exiting and entering vehicles. It's just a matter of time until there is a serious or fatal accident here, the risk of which will increase with more vehicles using the road with the subdivision. I could not appreciate this is the transport plan. I have personally had my parked vehicle driven into in that exact spot, to the extent of it being written off. Interestingly this didn't appear on the crash diagram, even though it was lodged with the police.	Clear wording and mapping around parking areas at Leamington Domain on Wordsworth St. There needs to be a dedicated off-road carpark for park users, that becomes the sole place to park when using the park.
220/3	Support in Part	Traffic	General increased traffic beyond this Leamington area is not highlighted for solutions. • The need for another means to cross the river is the main concern. • public transport routes need to be extended to be closer to the subdivision to encourage use. The buses should be planned to travel down Wordsworth, along Carlyle and up Browning. the Carlyle/ Browning/ Roto Rangi intersection needs to be improved prior to the establishment of the southern end of the subdivision. This is already a high use intersection, and I witness frequently incorrect road rules here. There will be more traffic along there even with the northern end of the subdivision only, especially as this is the road used to the school and daycare on Lamb st.	Plans within the rest of the town for increased road use and need (ie bridges).
222/1	Oppose	Traffic	I am deeply concerned that this development will place further strain on a town that is already operating beyond its capacity. In particular, traffic congestion is already a significant issue in our area, and I believe the proposed development will greatly worsen traffic flow and road safety for local residents. Addison Street and surrounding roads are not designed to cope with increased volumes of heavy vehicles, construction traffic, and daily commuter traffic that this proposal would inevitably bring.	To leave the zone for rural use not change to residential zoning
224/1	Oppose	Traffic	The traffic impact on local communities if the plan change was approved and went ahead without a new river crossing would have a significant detrimental impact to the not only the local Leamington community but also the entire Cambridge roading network. Shakespeare Rd is now a main throughfare road which has significant traffic flow not only at peak times and the two current bridges are pinch points impacting on traffic throughout the town. The increased traffic initially with the development and then once houses are built would exacerbate and have significant detrimental impact on traffic flow. The Transit decision not to create a Northern on ramp onto the Expressway past the golf course increases this with construction traffic heading and coming from the North needs to go through the town. I believe the council would be extremely negligent in allowing the plan change until a new bridge has been completed which appears to be many years away. The residential developments on the Cambridge side of town especially on the Northen boundaries have less impact as access to the town centre and Hamilton etc is not dependent on crossing the river. If for any reason the old bridge was taken out of service the town would experience serious gridlock with only the one crossing. This in untenable.	That council decline or defer the plan change until a new bridge has been built to better manage the traffic flows across the river and in Leamington.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
225/10	Oppose	Traffic	Traffic congestion is already a concern in this area and I am concerned that this proposal will worsen existing issues. In particular • I am unsure what measures are proposed to ensure that children and families can safely cross Shakespeare Street when travelling to schools or the town centre. • Turning right into Shakespeare Street from Addison Street is already difficult and at times unsafe. I am concerned that increasing traffic volumes will further compromise safety, and I am not convinced that the proposed mitigation measures will adequately address this. • The introduction of traffic signals at the Wordsworth Street and Shakespeare Street intersection may increase congestion rather than improve it, although this is not clearly explained in the application.	I oppose the proposed plan change
225/11	Oppose	Traffic	Lack of clarity regarding future transport connections, particularly in relation to Addison Street. While I do not support the establishment of a connector road in this location, I am concerned that the current proposal does not provide sufficient certainty that such a connection will not occur in the future. This matter should be clearly addressed through the District Plan provisions to avoid such connection.	I oppose the proposed plan change
225/9	Oppose	Traffic	The Integrated Transport Assessment does not appear to clearly address the full development potential enabled by Medium Density Residential zoning. I question whether the transport network has been appropriately modelled to reflect the likely intensity of development, and consider that this is an important matter that should be clarified.	I oppose the proposed plan change
226/4	Oppose	Traffic	The traffic flow heading out to this new subdivision will turn the surrounding streets into chaos. It's no longer going to be safe for our children to walk to school up the road as the dangers will be increased so much.	I would like this plan to be scrapped or at the very least compensated for the financial loss which this will impact on the value of our property.
227/1	Oppose	Traffic	This proposal will have a significant adverse effect on transport. The development's scale (~1,250 dwellings) and location will materially increase pressure on the existing road network, including the limited river connections between Cambridge and Leamington. The C4 & C6 growth cells in Leamington will foreseeably add further strain to the existing network. A further development of the proposed scale will predictably worsen congestion, disrupt connectivity during emergencies and temporary closures, and compromise the safety, efficiency and reliability of the transport system. Approving this development prior to resolving these problems will further exacerbate the issues mentioned above and will undermine attempts to achieve a well-functioning and resilient transport network that benefits all stakeholders. PC37 itself proposes staging trigger rules and transport upgrades, which acknowledges the surrounding network is capacity-sensitive. We do not accept that a new signalised intersection at Shakespeare Street/Wordsworth Street along with internal staging triggers will adequately address the wider network constraints, particularly cross-river movement and through-traffic issues.	That Council reject Private Plan Change PC37.
231/2	Oppose	Traffic	Increased traffic volumes—particularly construction traffic and heavy vehicles—will place unacceptable strain on roads that were not designed for this level or type of use, not to mention the noise and pollution. This development will significantly increase traffic volumes generally through residential streets, increasing safety risks for pedestrians, cyclists, children, and animals, and reducing neighbourhood amenity. Parking is already at a premium in the town and increasing the population further will create even more of a parking issue and congestion in Cambridge town itself.	I urge Council to reconsider this proposal until comprehensive infrastructure planning—including transport, bridges, parking, and safety measures—is demonstrably in place. Growth should be carefully staged, aligned with infrastructure delivery, and designed to protect Cambridge's unique character and liveability.
233/1	Oppose	Traffic	Further strain on infrastructure, increased congestion - particularly Shakespeare St (oversize wagons etc.) general traffic disruption, damage to highways - loss of driver sanity. So many properties being built, most future owners having two vehicles this will certainly impose on peoples lives.	Not specified
235/1	Oppose	Traffic	There is plenty of evidence that Cambridge has grown to the extent that traffic levels are such that there is significant congestion at busy times.	I seek that Council decline this plan change, and any other early opening of planned residential areas until such time as ring roads or other traffic relief are addressed, including the Third Bridge and southern access to the expressway near the Golf Club
236/1	Oppose	Traffic	The congested period has increased markedly as Leamington subdivisions have come on line e.g. Cambridge Park and the present C4 cell development. The proposed Change 37 is much larger (estimated 1250 homes) than these two areas. Virtually all traffic from this Plan Change 37 will travel via Shakespeare Street in Leamington to Cambridge and to the expressway. There seems to be no traffic management plan from the developers or the Waipa District Council, before this development can start it needs to addressed.	Private Plan Change 37 should be halted until suitable traffic management is implemented to prevent Leamington and Cambridge becoming unliveable due to traffic congestion.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
236/2	Oppose	Traffic	Tony Rider has stated he would be prepared to fund any roading development in lieu of development contributions (Cambridge New 2 April 2026) I have just the plan for that. This development meets the Waikato River not far from the present access to the expressway for those travelling south or leaving the expressway to enter Cambridge. The third Cambridge bridge should be built here, south of Cambridge. The majority of traffic from this proposed subdivision will travel across that southern bridge immediately accessing the expressway north or south. As well traffic heading to Te Awamutu or west to Taranaki would have a much more direct route.	Tony Rider, Waipa District Council and NZTA need to investigate and action this before the expressway extension is too developed and well before this Plan Change is approved.
238/3	Oppose	Traffic	The ITA appears to assume a lower yield (based on residential zone provisions) rather than the potential MDRZ-enabled capacity, which could mean higher traffic movements than assessed. This increases my concern about congestion and traffic safety on surrounding roads, pedestrian crossings (particularly for school children crossing Shakespeare Street), and intersections that residents use daily. I am also concerned that there is no clear limitation on future proposals to add a roading connection to/through Addison Street, which already experiences congestion at the Shakespeare Street intersection and currently has a quieter residential feel because of lower traffic volumes.	Decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37 (Rider Park Structure Plan). Alternatively, if Council is minded to approve all or part of the plan change, approve it only with whatever amendments, staging, and/or conditions Council considers appropriate to address the concerns raised in submissions and evidence (including any further information, assessment, or consultation Council considers necessary). Grant any other relief that Council considers appropriate and consistent with the purpose of the plan change process. That the District Plan provisions (or conditions) clearly prevent any future through connection via Addison Street, or otherwise set specific limits and criteria that protect resident safety and amenity.
239/1	Oppose	Traffic	The proposed plan change is badly timed if allowed to proceed. Roading from Leamington to Cambridge is already congested and this development will add considerably to traffic congestion. I oppose the submission and suggest it, and any similar developments in Leamington, be put on hold until roading and traffic issues between Leamington and Cambridge are addressed. A third bridge and north access to and from the Cambridge expressway should be a priority.	Place the proposed Private Plane Change 37 - Rider Park Structure Plan on hold until major infrastructure issues including roading are addressed. Provide a comprehensive plan to address major infrastructure across Cambridge and Leamington.
240/2	Support in Part	Traffic	Transport remains a key pressure point for Cambridge. Of particular concern is the Leamington side of the bridge, where congestion and peak-time pressures are already evident. Additional residential development without clear mitigation risks compounding traffic congestion, reduced accessibility for residents and businesses, and flow-on impacts across the wider roading network. There is also concern around downstream impacts, including potential future upgrades to surrounding roads such as Wordsworth Street.	Provide detailed transport modelling, including cumulative effects, and clearly defined mitigation strategies prior to progression. • What traffic modelling scenarios have been undertaken (including peak and cumulative growth)? • What are the projected impacts on the Leamington bridge and approaches? • What mitigation measures are proposed (e.g. upgrades, intersections, alternative routes)? • How will active transport (walking, cycling) be integrated?
241/2	Oppose	Traffic	Leamington's main roading infrastructure is not suitable for the significant increase in traffic movements arising from the proposal. It needs to be upgraded to meet the demands that would be placed on it. The increased traffic burden imposed by the proposal must be considered alongside the significant increase in the movement of very large and heavily loaded commercial vehicles that will be associated with the recently approved sand pit development on Newcombe Road.	That the proposed plan change be rejected
241/4	Oppose	Traffic	Because of the hold ups at the Browning St / Shakespeare St junction impatient drivers often resort to "rat running" along adjacent residential side streets. That will only increase in the future given the scale of the proposed development and with the current infrastructure. There will also be a commensurate safety risk to residents and those walking the side streets given that not all of them have footpaths down both sides.	That the proposed plan change be rejected
241/5	Oppose	Traffic	There is no reliable, regular bus service for travel in and around Cambridge. That means residents of the proposed development will drive to and transit through Leamington and the town itself. Leamington will inevitably be burdened with more parking problems.	That the proposed plan change be rejected
245/1	Oppose	Traffic	With only two bridges servicing the region and the amount of traffic this new residential area will escalate, it will be untenable with such a huge increase in traffic movements.	I object to any change / process to the proposed plan change 37 to proceed.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
247/1	Oppose	Traffic	Concerns regarding the anticipated increase in traffic on Shakespeare Street and its feeder roads, particularly Kingsley Street, which serves as a primary route for many Leamington residents. A matter of particular urgency is the kindergarten located on Kingsley Street. Young children can behave unpredictably and move quickly, the current conditions present a heightened and unacceptable level of risk. Existing Kingsley Street is consistently challenging, with peak periods creating especially hazardous conditions. the continuous flow of traffic often forces drivers to take risks in order to merge or cross, further compounding safety risks for all road users. Addressing these issues proactively will help ensure the safety of residents, road users, and, most importantly, the children who attend the kindergarten.	The introduction of traffic calming measures should be considered a priority to improve safety and reduce speeding. A review of traffic management and safety measures for Shakespeare Street, Kingsley Street, and the surrounding network should be prioritised.
248/2	Oppose	Traffic	Additional vehicle traffic for the proposed subdivision will exacerbate congestion and increase safety risks for cyclists, pedestrians and children. Notably Kingsley Street as a preferred bypass for Leamington residents. Given the presence of a kindergarten on this street, the certain increased traffic flow poses a serious hazard particularly at drop off and pick up times. the bridges from west to east will not accommodate approximately 1200 new homes with no new bridge planned for some time.	Decline this development. It is not in Cambridges best interests.
249/1	Support in Part	Traffic	The change in zone is likely to have a significant impact on transport connections between Leamington and Cambridge as follows: • there is no discussion on the transport connection across the Waikato River • it appears Council envisaged any new residential development being predominantly north and west of Cambridge • the earliest any new bridge construction is likely to start will be 2040 • PC37 has the potential to increase traffic by around 1800 car movements per day. This does not include the Te Awa development or infill that Leamington is currently experiencing Cambridge is the main retail and service centre, requiring most local Leamington households to travel across the river into Cambridge. It would therefore not be unreasonable to estimate an additional 3,000 - 4,000 car movements across the Waikato river by the time this development is complete and quite possibly before any bridge is built over the Waikato River.	Application should not be approved until such time as a new bridge is confirmed and a date finalised for its completion.
250/1	Oppose	Traffic	Cambridge's infrastructure is struggling to cope with the current growth of new subdivisions happening in Cambridge. The town cannot handle anymore new subdivisions. The roads are already grid locked and adding potentially over another 2000 cars to Shakespeare Street, and our two current bridges, is not realistic. We desperately need a third bridge just to cope with current traffic flow but sadly that seems a long way away. We need a northern access onto SH1 past the golf course to take traffic away from town and a Southern on ramp as well. Neither of these are in future plans.	To not allow the Proposed Private Plan Change 37 to go through
252/4	Oppose	Traffic	We have not received any indication as to how the proposed change to affect the entrance alteration would be achieved.	That Council does not proceed with this proposed plan change.
253/3	Oppose	Traffic	Keen to better understand whether transport outcomes align with Cambridge Connections and support safe, connected and sustainable movement across Cambridge and Leamington. Concern that transport considerations for this plan change must be assessed not only in terms of traffic generation and level of service, but also in relation to how the proposed development integrates with the wider Cambridge Connections network and objectives. In particular: • How the development connects into and potentially impacts the existing and planned transport network identified through Cambridge Connections • Access points into and out of the development area, including effects on Wordsworth Street and surrounding roads that already serve significant community destinations, including the cemetery, dog park and playground. • Impacts on surrounding residential streets and feeder roads, particularly during peak periods • School travel patterns, peak congestion and local connectivity • The safety, continuity and usability of walking and cycling connections, both within the development and linking to the wider town network. Transport infrastructure must not only support vehicle movement, but also contribute to a safe, connected and accessible town, consistent with the direction set through Cambridge Connections and community expectations.	That clarity and assurance be provided on: • How PC37 has been assessed against Cambridge Connections principles, projects and staging • Whether active transport connections are mandatory, continuous and deliverable, rather than aspirational • How will additional demand from PC37 be accommodated on existing roads without undermining the agreed Cambridge Connections outcomes. • What transport upgrades are assumed but not yet confirmed, funded or programmed • How transport impacts will be managed over time as development stages progress.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
254/2	Support in Part	Traffic	Appendix 7 - Notes the Maungatautari Rd & Lamb St intersections with Carlyle St have had 2 of the most serious reported accidents, given these are area's where West bound vehicles are slowing from 80km to 50km and entering a growing pedestrian environment. Appendix 17 - Notes a permeable & connected Neighbourhood appropriately scaled with a density of 25-35 dwellings per hectare, does this represent an opportunity to enclose the development in a safety blanket for Children, we already have examples of Traffic backed up from Shakespeare to Carlyle (& beyond) after large scale events at Karapiro, this volume could be representative of "Business As Usual" during & post the development.	Reassess Carlyle Street for collector / connector status from Browning to Wordsworth Streets and recognize the transit of children within & outside the development to Education Facilities across Browning and Shakespeare Streets
255/2	Oppose	Traffic	Traffic congestion is a particular concern. Current peak-hour conditions are already difficult, and an increase in population without corresponding infrastructure upgrades will only worsen delays and safety risks.	To not go ahead with this proposal! This would in no way be in the best interest of our town and community
257/3	Oppose	Traffic	The ITA does not appear to have taken into account the MDRZ zoning; which is significantly different to the standard 'residential zone' provisions which were likely relevant when the assessment was done. Has the roading network been modelled to reflect the full development capacity enabled under MDRS?	Decline
257/7	Oppose	Traffic	Turning right into Shakespeare Street (via Addison Street) is unsafe, during most hours of the days. We can't understand how significantly increasing traffic movements on an already congested street, represents a functional and safe option; despite the mitigation measures suggested by the traffic engineer. What specific measures are being put in place to ensure children living in the Addison Street area, can safely cross Shakespeare Street on their way to and from school?	Decline
257/8	Oppose	Traffic	We request absolute certainty (beyond all doubt) that a future connector road will not be established at the end of Addison Street. We request this be formally embedded in the District Plan as a Prohibited Activity.	Decline
258/1	Oppose	Traffic	Regardless of calculated numbers that show vehicle use is well within capacity, the reality is there is a huge lineup along Pope Terrace towards Victoria sStreet bridge every morning, and very slow moving traffic along Shakespeare Street towards the roundabout and following on towards the low level bridge. In late afternoon traffic is at a standstill all along Victoria street through town towards the Victoria street bridge and similarly along Albert Street and then up Shakespeare street. I believe adding 800+ dwellings on the Leamington side will exacerbate the traffic situation. Too many amenities, schools, etc are on the other side of the river in Cambridge town, which forces all Leamington residents to use one of the two bridges, not to mention many people are commuting to Hamilton for work every day and also have to get across the river.	Council not to grant the rezoning from Deferred Residential to Medium Density Residential Zone. Any major residential developments like this should only happen once a transportation plan for Cambridge (a third bridge) has been implemented.
259/1	Oppose	Traffic	I am concerned that there could in the future be access to the development through Addison Street. Even now there is significant traffic, much of it at high speed, and any increase would affect the safety of residents. The increase in traffic through Shakespeare Street will create more congestion on what is now the busiest road in our town.	That approval be declined.
261/2	Oppose	Traffic	Cambridge still relies on only two main bridge crossings and a limited road network. These routes already experience congestion at peak times and during events. - Adding a further 3,000–3,500 residents will significantly intensify pressure on SH1 corridors, main and supporting streets (e.g. Victoria Street, Shakespeare) and key intersections. - There is also a risk that this increased housing growth will continue to reinforce car dependency, particularly as public transport options remain limited. It is reasonable to assume that a large proportion of future residents will continue to work outside of Cambridge, particularly in Hamilton and surrounding employment hubs. Combined with school travel patterns (including secondary education outside the immediate area for many students), this creates a significant commuting population. This reinforces peak-hour pressure on already constrained transport routes and bridges.	To consider the following points in relation to this plan change: • That careful consideration is given to whether advancing the proposed plan change ahead of its original staging timeframe is appropriate at this time • That further assessment is undertaken of the cumulative effects of existing and already consented developments across Cambridge before additional large-scale rezoning is progressed. • That infrastructure capacity (including transport, water, wastewater, healthcare, education, and community services) continues to be closely considered alongside growth, to help ensure it remains aligned over time. • That a staged and coordinated approach to growth continues to be maintained where possible, in order to support the ongoing liveability, character, and service levels of Cambridge.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
262/2	Oppose	Traffic	Cambridge already has material transport problems. Rapid growth is putting pressure on a small number of key connections, there is only one bridge carrying heavy traffic over the Waikato River, and the existing river-crossing infrastructure is aging. This affects the resilience, safety and efficiency of our network. it is unsound to rezone for a large medium-density precinct now, before a core strategic transport solution for Cambridge and Leamington has been identified or funded.	We seek that Proposed Private Plan Change 37 be declined in full. In the alternative, if the Hearing Panel is not minded to decline the plan change entirely, we seek the following relief: • That all Rural zoned land outside the Deferred Residential framework in the District Plan be excluded from the rezoning. • That no rezoning or development proceed until core transport infrastructure is identified, funded and operational, including confirmed solutions for Cambridge river-crossing resilience and local network effects. • That no rezoning or development proceed until all necessary water supply and wastewater infrastructure is fully identified, funded, and operational for the scale of development proposed. • That the proposal be reduced in scale and density to align with the Deferred Residential framework, and protect the amenity, character and functioning of Leamington and Cambridge. • That full earthworks, stormwater, servicing and downstream effects be quantified and independently tested before any rezoning is considered.
263/1	Oppose	Traffic	More congestions on already busy roads. Further stain on infrastructure before major transport and roads are upgraded, this development is premature without the correct roading and planning in place via council. Puts more strain on the two bridges, which are beyond capacity already.	To not approve this Plan change
268/4	Neutral	Traffic	Although Appendix 1 of the Integrated Traffic Assessment identifies the 2022-2052 Waipā Transport Strategy as a relevant transportation strategy, there is no assessment of the proposal against the relevant objectives of the strategy.	Consideration as to whether the Structure Plan would achieve and ensure consistency with the objectives of the 2022-2052 Waipa Transport Strategy.
268/5	Neutral	Traffic	The Integrated Traffic Assessment should include assessments of the cumulative and compounding traffic effects (including but not limited to cross-river capacity and the wider network).	That the Integrated Traffic Assessment is updated to include assessments of the Structure Plan's cumulative and compounding traffic effects. Or any other relief considered necessary and appropriate to address the issues raised by this submission.
268/6	Neutral	Traffic	As the Structure Plan does not identify any indicative stage boundaries or internal roading networks, Council is unable to determine whether the proposed traffic infrastructure upgrades (including key intersections and corridors) are appropriate, efficient and timely.	That the Integrated Traffic Assessment is updated to include the indicative stage boundaries or internal roading networks, and the appropriateness, efficiency and timing of the traffic infrastructure solutions are considered. Infrastructure must be delivered prior to or concurrently with the stages of development that generate the demand for it. Or any other relief considered necessary and appropriate to address the issues raised by this submission.
268/7	Neutral	Traffic	With no indicative internal pedestrian / cycle networks identified, the Structure Plan does not demonstrate safe and convenient travel for non-car modes.	Consideration of walking and cycling connections to Leamington Primary School, Cambridge Middle School and Cambridge High School, Shakespeare Street Commercial Zone and bus stop, and the Te Awa River Ride. Or any other relief considered necessary and appropriate to address the issues raised by this submission.
271/5	Oppose	Traffic	I will be directly and detrimentally affected by Traffic Congestion. The injection of approximately 1,250 additional dwellings will cause significant congestion on a roading network that is already struggling. This poses safety risks and degrades the level of service for current users.	Decline Private Plan Change 37 in its entirety, or in the alternative, should the Council be minded to approve any part of the plan change, I seek that: • it be deferred until such time as the "Third Bridge" and associated transport network upgrades are fully funded, consented, and operational. • comprehensive construction management triggers that strictly limit noise, dust, and heavy vehicle movements to standard business hours are implemented, with independent monitoring paid for by the developer.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
273/3	Neutral	Traffic	Quality pedestrian and cycle connections through neighbourhoods, including to schools, have health and safety benefits for children and reduce traffic generation at pick up and drop off times. All existing and potential future schools, and the communities they serve, should be well serviced by safe and accessible pedestrian and cycling links through the community. This includes safe and convenient connections to the existing developed Cambridge area so that the site covered by the PCA is well integrated into the existing urban structure. The Ministry supports integrated transport outcomes that enable safe walking and cycling to schools. The Ministry broadly agrees with the proposed walking and cycling provisions throughout the PCA. Within Section 5.4 of the Transport Assessment, the Transport Expert states that *"the Structure Plan and cycling networks are expected to be highly permeable and designed to minimise the length of trips made by these modes"*. Within Section 4.5 of the Assessment of Environmental Effects, the design principles state *"Pedestrian and cycle movement is catered for through the provision of pedestrian/cycling links.* *These movement corridors seek to provide regular opportunities for pedestrians and cyclicts to access safe, protected routes with limited vehicle crossings… and link to public open spaces and into the wider walking and cycling network in Leamington and beyond"*. The Ministry's requested relief will support connectivity to existing local schools, town centres and the surrounding community in a safe and effective manner.	The Ministry seeks that pedestrian and cycle linkages are operational from the outset to support the development and that they consider the most vulnerable users in their design.

Ecology

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
5/4	Oppose	Ecology	The plan identifies an indicative neighbourhood centre right next to the nature reserve area next to Leamington Cemetery. There will be pollution and human impact on this natural area- particularly it's beautiful stream, when it becomes surrounded by houses, roads, and shops.	To not allow development surrounding the nature reserve and pa site.
56/4	Oppose	Ecology	Loss of environmental values. The rezoning may adversely affect local ecological values. These effects have not been adequately avoided, remedied, or mitigated.	**Primary relief:** Decline Private Plan Change 37 in its current form. **Alternative relief** (if the plan change is approved in some form): Amend the structure plan to provide Improved protection of environmental features and ecological values.
69/4	Oppose	Ecology	I am concerned that increased light pollution and loss of old growth trees will destroy the habitat and flight paths of the Critically Endangered Long-tailed bat (Pekapeka-tou-roa), which are known to reside in this area.	I seek that the Council decline Private Plan Change 37 in its current form. Alternatively, I seek the following amendments and conditions: • Ecological Protection: Implement strict lighting and vegetation controls to protect the flight paths and habitat of the Long-tailed bat.
78/2	Support in Part	Ecology	The stream running through the reserve by the cemetery runs clear nearly all the time. I would hate to see it contaminated with sediment , especially during construction time	Not specified
82/3	Oppose	Ecology	I am also deeply concerned at the environmental impact of a development, especially as close to the river at this one appears to be. What are the environmental impacts of the stormwater and sewerage management of this proposed area.	I would like the council to decline this current request until robust, evidence based information is sought by the current landowner and communicated to the current ratepayers for a second round of submissions if the landowner wishes to resubmit at that point
91/6	Oppose	Ecology	The southeastern Leamington area is a confirmed habitat for the Long-tailed Bat (Pekapeka-tou-roa), which is classified as "Nationally Critical." • Habitat Destruction: The removal of mature trees and hedgerows to make way for 1,250 homes will destroy essential roosting sites. • Light Pollution: The introduction of high-intensity street lighting and residential light spill will disrupt the nocturnal flight paths and foraging behavior of these bats.	I seek that the Waipa District Council decline Private Plan Change 37 in its entirety.

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			A development of this density is incompatible with the survival of this species in our local area. Stormwater Runoff: The vast increase in impermeable surfaces (roofs and roads) will result in massive amounts of urban runoff, carrying pollutants into the river ecosystem.	
103/1	Support in Part	Ecology	The existing piece of native bush and corresponding stream require special care. Adjoining plantings need to be empathetic with native plantings, not exotic. Rain water connections to the existing stream need to be carefully integrated so they don't compromise water quality and biodiversity in the gully. Our submission is that there should be independent assessment and monitoring of this site.	Care is taken to protect the forest, stream and Pa which is adjacent to the development. Independent monitoring and reporting is a condition of the development.
144/1	Support in Part	Ecology	The Ecological Impact Assessment does not include an assessment of the vegetation and habitat on the Site to determine its ecological significance in accordance with Appendix 5 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (WRPS) or Appendix 1 of National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB) to determine which parts of the Site and what proportion of it, meet section 6(c) of the Act. This will be required to determine what and how much habitat on the site will be protected and whether residual effect management (compensation) is appropriate when addressing the loss of section 6(c) habitat. The Department does not agree with the assessment of the loss of potential roost trees as a low level of effect. Long-tailed bats have very specific thermal requirements for raising young, and suitable roosts for raising young are rare even in large, mature forests. Suitable roosts will be much rarer in this rural and urban landscape. It is erroneous to assess the magnitude of effect as low because there are other trees in the surrounding area. Loss of an active roost, particularly a maternity roost, would result in a significant adverse effect on this critically endangered species. Section 9.2.1 of the Ecological Impact Assessment lists a key threat to bats as predation by introduced mammals but the report does not assess the effects of increased predation risk that could occur as a result of an increase in domestic pets likely to result from an increase in residential density.	• Undertake additional ecological impact assessment to address the gaps identified in this submission point. • Assess the Site in accordance with Appendix 5 of the WRPS and/or Appendix 1 of NPSIB to determine its ecological significance. • Use this information to revise proposed provisions as necessary to give effect to the NPSIB and Waikato RPS, including by: Avoiding adverse effects on areas/habitat meeting section 6(c) of the Act. • The Department is interested and seeks engagement with Waipā District Council to refine the implementation deficiencies identified in this submission prior to a hearing. • The Department requests Waipā District Council engage a Suitably Qualified Bat Ecologist to peer review the Ecological Impact Assessment.
144/2	Support in Part	Ecology	As development of housing and roading around Cambridge increases and bat habitat decreases, the importance of the green belt (and contiguous reserve areas) will increase for bats. This needs further consideration. Light which may spill into these areas does not only come from external fixtures, but also from car headlights and from windows. A substantial width of planting would help to minimise light spill into the green belt and reserves, and this should be reflected in the Structure Plan.	The requirement for the Landscape Concept Plan to require a 15-metre planting buffer between areas zoned MDRS and the green belt and reserves to reduce the impact of lighting on long-tailed bat habitat is incorporated into the structure plan. New Rule 15.4.2.91A (c) - Rider Park Structure Plan Area – Subdivision Parameters is amended to read A Landscape Concept Plan for each development / subdivision stage is provided that, stipulates what the development stages are and clearly identifies what the concept plan is seeking to address (i.e. overall design approach, details of planting for reserve areas, details of street tree planting, design and landscape treatment of cycleways and pedestrian networks within road reserve and reserve areas), <u>and provides for a 15 metre planted buffer between areas zoned MDRS and green belt and reserve areas.</u>
144/3	Support in Part	Ecology	The Ecological Impact Assessment recommends management measures and compensation should be detailed in a Bat Management Plan for the plan change. Such a management plan is not referenced anywhere else in the application documents and is not provided for by any proposed objectives, policies or rules. The proposed approach to require and implement a bat management plan (albeit not required by the proposed rule framework) defers protection of bat habitat to the consent application stage, with no certainty as to how development will avoid, remedy and mitigate adverse ecological effects and achieve no net loss as is required by ECO-P1 of the WRPS and the RMA. Utilising the vesting of reserves with Waipā District Council as the timeframe for which pest control and monitoring	A comprehensive set of objectives, policies, rules and assessment criteria/information requirements relating to ecological values within the plan change area, particularly relating to long-tailed bats and their habitat, and measures to protect, maintain and enhance those values. These provisions should reflect the recommendations of the Ecological Impact Assessment (including any updates required to address the matters discussed in this submission). No development within the structure plan should commence until such time as the Bat Management Plan has been certified.

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			will be conducted means that the specific timeframe for which this compensation measure is undertaken is not clearly specified. The Department recommends that a specific timeframe (e.g. X years) should be specified to ensure that the pest control and monitoring results in the benefits intended to appropriately compensate for the adverse effects identified.	The Bat Management Plan should include, but not be limited to, the following matters: • Identification of all confirmed or potential bat roost trees within the structure plan area based on presence of roosting features and any other relevant information which is available; • Tree removal methodology and timing for all confirmed or potential bat roost trees which are proposed to be removed, with regard to the Department of Conservation "Protocols for minimising the risk of felling occupied bat roosts", produced by the NZ DOC Bat Recovery Group 2024, or any other update to that document; • Details of proposed biodiversity compensation to ensure that development of the Rider Park Structure Plan achieves a no net loss outcome for long tailed bat habitat values. This shall include: - The legal mechanisms proposed to ensure the ongoing protection of the compensation area being the gully, river embankment and escarpment within the site; - Planting and maintenance specifications; - An implementation programme for the habitat enhancement; - A methodology and maintenance programme for artificial roost boxes and the creation of new roosting habitat; - A methodology and programme for predator control and monitoring; - How the financial contribution to predator control in the wider landscape will be undertaken. • Procedures for the certification, review, and amendment (if necessary) of the BMP, including an opportunity for DOC to comment; • The requirement for the BMP to be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced person.
144/4	Support in Part	Ecology	Section 3.8.4 of the Ecological Impact Assessment lists a number of measures that can be utilised to manage the effects on bat habitat from increased levels of lighting. These measures have not been incorporated into the Structure Plan planning framework and should be implemented to ensure the management of the effects identified in the Ecological Impact Assessment.	Incorporate management measures from Ecological Impact Assessment into Structure Plan
144/5	Support in Part	Ecology	New Rule 2A.4.2.70 (Post Construction Lighting) • Lighting effects from roads and housing were addressed in detail by the Environment Court in Weston Lea where the Court imposed conditions requiring light to be attenuated to a maximum brightness of 0.1 lux and a colour temperature maximum of 2700 kelvin adjacent to bat protection areas (similar to within 'Light Management Areas' referred to in this Project) • 'Fixed artificial outdoor lighting' and 'artificial exterior lighting' are the types of lighting to which these provisions apply, but neither of these terms defined in the operative district plan or proposed plan change • These standards can also apply during the construction phase of the enabled development to manage lighting effects on long-tailed bats The Department recommends that the activity status for activities that fail to comply with this proposed rule is amended to discretionary to provide for comprehensive decision making whereby the activity is assessed against the relevant objectives and policies, including those sought by the Department. If a restricted discretionary activity status is retained, the Department have changes to the matters of discretion	• Amend heading of Rule 2A.4.2.70 to read: C5 Structure Plan Area - ~~Post Construction~~ Lighting. • Amend Rule 2A.4.2.70(a) to read: Added illuminance from fixed artificial outdoor lighting shall not exceed 0.1 ~~0.3~~ lux (horizontal and vertical) at any height at the external boundary of any Light Management Area (LMA). Lighting attached to a vehicle is not considered to be fixed. • Amend activity status for non-compliance with Rule 2A.4.2.70 to be a discretionary activity. • If restricted discretionary activity status is retained amend matters of discretion restriction for lighting effects to read: "*Lighting effects, including on long tailed bats*"
144/6	Support in Part	Ecology	If financial contributions are necessary to fund any biodiversity offsetting or compensation, this should be clearly signalled through a transparent planning framework, in PC37 provisions, as required under section 77E of the RMA.	Add new subrule (iii) to Rule 2A.4.2.71 - Structure Plan Areas: Development Agreement to read: • *Specify how financial contributions for bio diversity compensation will be provided for to address adverse effects on long-tailed bats.*

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
155/4	Oppose	Ecology	I am concerned that increased light pollution and loss of old growth trees will destroy the habitat and flight paths of the Critically Endangered Long-tailed bat (Pekapeka-tou-roa), which are known to reside in this area.	Decline Private Plan Change 37 in its current form. Alternatively: Ecological Protection: Implement strict lighting and vegetation controls to protect the flight paths and habitat of the Long tailed bat.
178/2	Oppose	Ecology	The proposed development raises significant concerns regarding biodiversity loss and ecological degradation. These include habitat loss and fragmentation, increased sedimentation and stormwater runoff, and disturbance or displacement of wildlife. The environment within and surrounding the site contributes to the wider ecological network of the district. Development at this scale should demonstrate clear avoidance of sensitive ecological areas, not simply rely on mitigation.	That the Council decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37 as notified, or substantially amend it to address the matters raised in this submission before any approval is considered. Robust biodiversity assessments addressing cumulative effects over time are required, alongside enforceable protections for ecological corridors and habitats to ensure long-term environmental resilience.
178/3	Oppose	Ecology	Concerns exist regarding increased stormwater discharges, sedimentation during construction, and long-term water quality impacts resulting from intensified land use. The cumulative effects on the Waikato River and its tributaries must be clearly quantified and addressed.	That the Council decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37 as notified, or substantially amend it to address the matters raised in this submission before any approval is considered.
178/4	Oppose	Ecology	The relationship between the proposed development, the town belt, and river margins also requires further consideration. These areas serve important functions including ecological buffering, recreation, landscape character, and wellbeing.	That the Council decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37 as notified, or substantially amend it to address the matters raised in this submission before any approval is considered. Stronger setbacks, planting, and monitoring requirements are necessary to protect these values.
191/3	Oppose	Ecology	Ecologically the area adjacent and within the northeastern portion of the proposed plan change area is of significant amenity to the existing residents of the area, the stream and gully are of significant beauty and are the only place in Cambridge (except the Waikato river) that offers flowing clean fresh water. The various species of bats and birds identified will be affected in a more than minor way during the addition of thousands of homes and the several thousand more people who will want to share the same space.	Reject the application for the private plan change so generations of family's can continue to live and enjoy the amenity that currently exits. Keep the growth within the current plan area
202/4	Oppose	Ecology	The development has ecological impacts that will be negative.	The Council should not approve this change to plan due to the ecological impacts.
207/3	Oppose	Ecology	I disagree with the statement about the native birds being of little value. The proximity to Maungatautari Sanctuary Mountain and its ever-increasing population of native birds means our town is in the uniquely lucky position of being able to benefit from this. Current (and future) residents value our birds and it should not be so summarily dismissed.	Do not allow any part of this Proposed Plan Change to go ahead.
219/4	Oppose	Ecology	My key concerns are effects on local ecology, especially with long-tailed bats.	That the Proposed Private Plan Change 37 be declined in full
220/4	Support in Part	Ecology	The native bat population which is highlighted in the ecological assessment. Page 19, figure 5 shows areas of activity / passes by bats. There is a high activity area on the site boundary that is bordering the sports fields, which is along a tree hedge. I believe much of that tree line has been removed already, certainly all around the dog park it has. It raises some alarm bells about potential disregard to this vulnerable species, which has been highlighted in this report as high risk.	Tree line of bat use investigated.
221/2	Oppose	Ecology	My concerns are effects on local ecology	I seek that the Proposed private plan change 37 be declined in full
227/3	Oppose	Ecology	PC37 acknowledges significant adverse effects on long-tailed bats (a threatened Nationally Critical species) due to permanent loss of foraging/commuting habitat. The proposal relies on compensation measures such as planting and predator control to mitigate the adverse effects, however these will be proportionately inadequate compared to the disruption from lighting and substantial loss of green space. Where a development results in high residual ecological effects on a Nationally Critical species, we consider this weighs heavily against approval. Compensation does not remove the immediate loss of habitat and creates long time-lag risks, particularly over a long staging programme.	That Council reject Private Plan Change PC37.
238/7	Oppose	Ecology	I am concerned to see suggestions in the application material that effects on bats could be high, while the response appears to rely primarily on compensation rather than clear, enforceable avoidance and mitigation measures. I ask what specific rules, design requirements, and long-term management (e.g., lighting controls, habitat protection / creation, and monitoring) will be required to reduce harm to bats, noting that other recent subdivisions where bat effects are known (such as Peacocke in Hamilton) have included more explicit controls.	Decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37 (Rider Park Structure Plan). Alternatively, if Council is minded to approve all or part of the plan change, approve it only with whatever amendments, staging, and/or conditions Council considers appropriate to address the concerns raised in submissions and evidence (including any further information, assessment, or consultation Council considers necessary). Grant any other relief that Council considers appropriate and consistent with the purpose of the plan change process.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
240/7	Support in Part	Ecology	The Chamber understands that the area may form part of a bat sensitivity corridor, which is an important ecological consideration. There is currently insufficient clarity around the extent of ecological impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and ongoing management of this corridor.	Provide clear, detailed mitigation strategies to protect ecological values, particularly relating to bat habitats and movement corridors via a complete Ecological Management Plan.
260/1	Support in Part	Ecology	The Titoki Landcare EIA identifies a range of measures to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the effects of the residential development proposed through PC37 on bat habitat and other biodiversity values. Forest & Bird submits that these recommendations must be given effect through the plan change itself – through plan provisions, inclusion of detail on the Structure Plan, zone rules, and any assessment matters to guide future consent conditions. In particular, Forest & Bird supports and seeks directive plan provisions that give effect to the following categories of recommendation from the Titoki Landcare EIA, this includes: • Bat Habitat Management • Lighting Management • Ecological Corridors and Restoration Planting • Pest Control The National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 (NPSIB) sets out direction on the management of adverse effects in relation to indigenous biodiversity and local authorities have an obligation to give effect to the objective and policies. Full implementation of the Titoki Landcare EIA recommendations is, in our view, the minimum required to satisfy these obligations in the context of PC37. Forest & Bird asks the hearings panel to be satisfied that the recommended measures, once adopted, will genuinely achieve no net loss – and to require the applicant to demonstrate this through a clear biodiversity outcomes framework before the plan change is confirmed.	That PC37 be approved only on the condition that all effects management recommendations contained in the Titoki Landcare Ecological Impact Assessment (Appendix 5) are adopted as requirements through plan provisions, structure plan rules, and/or consent conditions. Including: • That the Bat Management Plan recommended by Titoki Landcare be required as a condition precedent to any subdivision or development activity, and that it be approved in consultation with the Department of Conservation. • That roost trees and foraging corridors identified in the EIA be given permanent protection through the Structure Plan or an appropriate overlay. With setbacks and clear rules preventing tree removal without ecological assessment and effects management to protect pekapeka and their habitat. • That lighting management standards recommended by Titoki Landcare be incorporated as enforceable rules within the Structure Plan and zone provisions, to protect bat foraging habitat from light spill. • That restoration planting, ecological corridor, and pest control requirements from the EIA be included as binding obligations, with clear timeframes, funding arrangements, and monitoring requirements. • That the applicant be required to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the hearings panel, that the recommended measures will achieve the protection of significant indigenous biodiversity values consistent with the objectives and policies of National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2023.
262/6	Oppose	Ecology	The application will have a high level of effect on Threatened – Nationally Critical long-tailed bats from permanent habitat loss. The applicant's Ecological Impact Assessment includes detailed recommendations for managing effects on long-tailed bats, but the proposed Modified Rule Framework does not include rules giving effect to these recommendations. If these measures are left to the consenting stage, we are concerned that the ecological mitigation and compensation measures will not be implemented or will not be implemented to the standard recommended by the applicant's ecologist.	We seek that Proposed Private Plan Change 37 be declined in full. In the alternative, if the Hearing Panel is not minded to decline the plan change entirely, we seek the following relief: That the ecological mitigation and compensation measures be implemented to the standard recommended by the applicant's ecologist.
268/21	Neutral	Ecology	While the Ecological Impact Assessment recommends the 20m wide Light Management Area around the edge of the site, there is no assessment of the appropriateness or effectiveness of the area. Additionally, the assessment also recommends $200,000 of compensation to Council or a local community trust for predator control in the wider landscape but does not identify how the figure was calculated or demonstrate its appropriateness.	That a peer review of the Ecological Impact Assessment is undertaken to confirm the appropriateness and effectiveness of the assessment and recommendations, and that the calculation and justification of the proposed compensation is provided.
268/30	Neutral	Ecology	The proposed use within the Light Management Area (LMA) that extends into the site adjacent to the Pā is not clear. The Structure Plan Image shows Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ), while Figure 6 of the Ecological Impact Assessment shows the area as Wildlife Habitat Area. Given the LMA is proposed to avoid / minimise potential effects on long tailed bats, the shape of the extension and zoning both sides MDRZ has the potential to reduce the effectiveness of the area.	That the area within the LMA that extends into the site adjacent to the Pā is amended to be Indicative Local Purpose Reserve in accordance with the Ecological Impact Assessment.
268/48	Neutral	Ecology	There is no tree removal / pruning activity rule or standards proposed, which would mean that bat habitat trees could be removed as a permitted activity.	That a rule is added (similar to Rule 10.4.2.22 - Airport Business Zone) to identify that removal / pruning of potential bat habitat trees will require resource consent for a Restricted Discretionary Activity.
268/50	Neutral	Ecology	New Rule 2A.4.2.70 – Post Construction Lighting • The Light Management Area proposed around the perimeter of the Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) may not be appropriate, measurable or enforceable. For example, it is not clear how the Ecological Impact Assessment	That the appropriateness, measurability and enforceability of New Rule 2A.4.2.70 is confirmed. Or any other relief considered necessary and appropriate to address the issues raised by this submission.

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			arrived at the 20m wide, the proposed 0.3 lux is a very low level of illuminance, and a large number to properties/dwellings would adjoin the Light Management Area once subdivided and developed.	
274/7	Neutral	Ecology	Section 9.11.1.3 of the plan change request comments on Policy ECO-P2 of the WRPS. However, we note that given the ecological values of the plan change site identified in the Ecological Assessment, particularly in relation to long-tailed bats, a number of other provisions of the Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity (ECO) chapter are also relevant to the plan change. This includes Objective ECO-O1, Policy ECO-P1 and Methods ECO-M1, ECOM2, ECO-M3, ECO-M13 and ECO-M14. We also note that the northern portion of the plan change site is within a Biodiversity Corridor ('750m River/Stream Corridor') under the Waipā District Plan. We recommend that an assessment be provided in relation to F585the relevant objectives and policies within Section 24 of the district plan relating to maintenance and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity within biodiversity corridors.	Provide assessments against all relevant provisions of the ECO chapter of the WRPS and the relevant objectives and policies of Section 24 of the Waipā District Plan.
274/8	Neutral	Ecology	We seek the following clarifications/areas of further assessment in relation to the Ecological Assessment. We note that planting cavity-bearing trees is a long-term mitigation option and may not result in desired outcomes. Installing artificial roost boxes and treating weedy trees are not guaranteed to be successful at providing appropriate roosting conditions (thermal, humidity, etc). We query how the outcomes of these mitigation options are to be assessed in the short-medium-long term. If these are not successful, have alternatives or increasing these measures been considered? When is the trigger point for this (e.g. in the short-term; after 5 years of no occupancy)?	Provide updates to the Ecological Assessment to address all matters identified in this submission point.
274/9	Neutral	Ecology	We seek the following clarifications/areas of further assessment in relation to the Ecological Assessment. Table 3 should identify the actual/potential effect, ecological value, magnitude, mitigation measures and overall level of effect prior to and following mitigation.	Provide updates to the Ecological Assessment to address all matters identified in this submission point.
274/10	Neutral	Ecology	We seek the following clarifications/areas of further assessment in relation to the Ecological Assessment. Further detail be provided in relation to the bird surveys undertaken (Section 4.2), including how many hours and days in the year the opportunistic observations were undertaken, and what buffer/search distance from the site was used for the reviewed databases.	Provide updates to the Ecological Assessment to address all matters identified in this submission point.
274/11	Neutral	Ecology	We seek the following clarifications/areas of further assessment in relation to the Ecological Assessment. We query whether there was no rank grass or suitable habitat around fencelines or on the western edge of the site where trees have been removed due to damage from Cyclone Gabrielle. Suitable surveys are required if habitat is available on site to determine copper skink presence.	Provide updates to the Ecological Assessment to address all matters identified in this submission point.
274/12	Neutral	Ecology	We seek the following clarifications/areas of further assessment in relation to the Ecological Assessment. Section 6 does not describe the wetlands on-site as 'natural inland wetlands' under the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) criteria. We recommend the report specifies if all wetlands are considered 'natural inland wetlands'. There appears to be a potential wetland in the north eastern corner of the site. It would be useful to know if this area was considered in any assessment.	Provide updates to the Ecological Assessment to address all matters identified in this submission point.
274/13	Neutral	Ecology	We seek the following clarifications/areas of further assessment in relation to the Ecological Assessment. Regarding Table 13, with the lack of understanding of bat roost availability in the surrounding landscape (as per Section 3.8.2 of the report), it is unclear how the magnitude of effect would be considered low. The overall level of effect is dependent on the short-term success of mitigation measures which are not guaranteed to be successful.	Provide updates to the Ecological Assessment to address all matters identified in this submission point.
274/14	Neutral	Ecology	We seek the following clarifications/areas of further assessment in relation to the Ecological Assessment. Regarding Section 9.1 that "The removal of potential roosting habitat for long-tailed bats is assessed as a Moderate level of effect and recommendations are made to remedy this effect through the creation of new suitable roosting habitat within the Site to reduce the level of effect to Low", we query how the suitability of created roosting habitat is going to be assessed. We recommend that more detail be provided on this.	Provide updates to the Ecological Assessment to address all matters identified in this submission point.
274/15	Neutral	Ecology	We seek the following clarifications/areas of further assessment in relation to the Ecological Assessment. The more detail be provided on how the proposed compensation was calculated. This includes how the figure of $200,000 to be contributed to Waipā District Council or a local community trust for predator control and monitoring was calculated, and more detail on how many years this is likely to cover.	Provide updates to the Ecological Assessment to address all matters identified in this submission point.
274/16	Neutral	Ecology	We note that Figure 6 of the Ecological Assessment, which shows 'proposed mitigation areas', identifies the escarpment area in the north-west of the site as 'Wildlife Habitat Area', surrounded by a proposed 'Light Management Area'. The proposed Structure Plan shows a Light Management Area in this location; however, the escarpment area itself is shown as Medium Density Residential Zone.	Clarify whether the Ecological Assessment recommends that the escarpment area in the north-west of the site be protected as reserve and update the Structure Plan accordingly.

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			It is unclear whether the Ecological Assessment recommendations are based on this area being protected as a reserve. This should be clarified, and the Structure Plan updated to ensure it reflects the recommendations of the Ecological Assessment.	
274/17	Neutral	Ecology	The north-eastern boundary of the site adjoins a vegetated gully area to the east. The area of the plan change site adjacent to this boundary is proposed to be rezoned to Medium Density Residential Zone. While there is a Light Management Area proposed along this boundary, the proposed development of this area has potential to reduce connectivity between the gully to the east of the site and the Waikato River. We recommend further consideration be provided to whether additional measures (e.g. a planted buffer area) are needed to address this.	Provide further consideration as to whether additional measures are needed to address potential loss of habitat connectivity in the north-eastern corner of the plan change area.
274/19	Neutral	Ecology	Long-tailed bats are a Threatened - Nationally Critical species present in the Waipā area. The Ecological Assessment identifies that the PPC37 site provides commuting and foraging habitat for long-tailed bats and that the site contains potential bat roost trees. Given the identified ecological effects of the proposal, particularly on long-tailed bats and their habitat, we recommend the provisions of the plan change be strengthened to meet the direction of the WRPS, particularly Policies ECO-P1 and ECO-P2 and Methods ECO-M1 and ECO-M13, and reflect the recommendations of the Ecological Assessment.	Add issues, objectives, policies, rules and assessment criteria / information requirements in relation to the maintenance and enhancement of ecological values, particularly long tailed bats and their habitat, within the plan change area. These provisions should reflect the recommendations of the Ecological Assessment. The rules should include a requirement to prepare an Ecological Management Plan for the plan change area as part of the first subdivision or land use consent for the area. This should include the following: • A Bat Management Plan - prepared by a suitably experienced bat ecologist, which provides further detail on measures to avoid, minimise, remedy and compensate for effects on long-tailed bats and their habitat, • A pest/weed management plan • Guidance on avoidance of native bird nesting / nests during tree felling and land disturbance • Guidance on avoidance if lizard habitat is available • Design and construction of stormwater infrastructure to demonstrate negligible impact on wetlands.
274/20	Support	Ecology	We support proposed Rule 2A.4.2.70 to mitigate lighting effects on long tailed bats, in accordance with the recommendations of the Ecological Assessment.	Retain proposed Rule 2A.4.2.70.
274/21	Neutral	Ecology	Other recent plan changes in the Waipā (PC14 - Mangaone Precinct) and Hamilton areas affecting long tailed bat habitat have included minimum building setback requirements from the edge of reserves/bat habitat areas. We note the plan change proposes geotechnical setbacks from the majority of the indicative reserve areas, however the Ecological Assessment does not discuss whether any setback rules are recommended to minimise adverse effects on bats/bat habitat within the Rider Park Structure Plan area.	Consider whether any additional building setback rule is needed to minimise adverse effects on bats / bat habitat.

Cultural Heritage

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
91/8	Oppose	Cultural Heritage	The land is within the ancestral territory of Ngati Haua and Ngati Korokii Kahukura. The intensification of this land poses a direct risk to the mauri (life force) of the nearby Waikato River. The conversion of this land to high-density housing fails to respect the spiritual and historical connections of mana whenua to this landscape.	I seek that the Waipa District Council decline Private Plan Change 37 in its entirety.
150/4	Oppose	Cultural Heritage	I would also be interested to know if there are archaeologically significant sites that would be impacted by this and whether they would be acknowledged and protected.	Not specified
178/1	Oppose	Cultural Heritage	While archaeological assessments identify specific sites, Māori heritage cannot be reduced to individual mapped locations alone. The area subject to PC37 forms part of a wider cultural landscape, where wāhi tupuna, historical pathways, waterways, and landforms are deeply interconnected. Although archaeological assessments have been completed, concern remains that the proposal emphasises site-specific avoidance rather than genuine protection of the broader cultural landscape. The cultural, spiritual, and historical relationships between land, water, and people must be acknowledged in a meaningful and enforceable way. There must be ongoing engagement with mana whenua at all stages of planning, design, and implementation. Without this, the proposal risks incremental loss of irreplaceable cultural heritage.	That the Council decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37 as notified, or substantially amend it to address the matters raised in this submission before any approval is considered. Stronger provisions are required to protect both recorded and unrecorded heritage values, including those yet to be identified.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
181/3	Oppose	Cultural Heritage	Insufficient honouring of the values and visions of predecessors • there is a real scope for active engagement of Māori. The whenua is of major significance to local iwi, hapu and whanau and their insights into matters that are important into making and implementing plans will be valuable. • insufficient valuing of the original individual / group who conceived the idea of the greenbelt. Visuall the Milan Park site enhances the 'green effect' of the vision of the individual who originated the greenbelt design. There is currently a synergistic effect that would be lost loss of the vision of Tony Rider in establishing Milan Park Stud. It is important that any changes in the use of Milan Park retain aspects of the legacy of the design and layout of the stud.	Reject the proposal. Give the opportunity to individuals to join with Tony to come up with a new plan that enables a lighter footprint on the whenua of Rider Park. Aid application into rezoning into an appropriate category of zone.
191/4	Oppose	Cultural Heritage	The historic pa site located adjacent to the development has not been fully restored and it can't be said with certainty that the scale of earthworks and development wouldn't have a less than minor impact on sacred cultural sites.	Reject the application for the private plan change so generations of family's can continue to live and enjoy the amenity that currently exits. Keep the growth within the current plan area
207/4	Oppose	Cultural Heritage	The archaeological heritage of the area has also been under valued. Our district has historically been a highly productive area, and the borrows are clear evidence of early Maori agricultural ability. There are few now visible in New Zealand, and those in the Rider Park proposal should be celebrated rather than built over.	Do not allow any part of this Proposed Plan Change to go ahead.
228/5	Oppose	Cultural Heritage	The proposed development is located adjacent to a pā site and other archaeological sites, the area would be culturally significant to local iwi/hapū. From the information shared on the development it is not clear whether or not iwi and hapū have been appropriately engaged with in terms of adverse effects on the site and how it will be protected.	I am seeking council to not allow the proposed changes to be approved
237/1	Support in Part	Cultural Heritage	HNZPT is concerned that development enabled by the proposed plan change could have adverse effects on historic cultural heritage, in particular archaeology both recorded and unrecorded. ***Archaeology*** • significant archaeology near / within the plan change site (Recorded Pā Site S15/24 is located on the edge of and overspills into the plan change area). • the archaeological assessment report recommends that future development plans should take account of recorded archaeological sites and avoid them to the extent possible. this is reference to the number of recorded borrow sites located across the plan change site. ***Cultural Heritage*** • HNZPT supports the recommendations of the cultural impact assessment to limit destruction of middens, borrow pits and apply a revised land use plan whereby the pā and well defined borrow pits be subject to a protective land covenant.	Support PC37 in principle subject to the inclusion of a site development plan for inclusion in the district Plan that shows: • Indicative location of all recorded archaeological sites in and near the development site. • An agreed buffer zone around the edge of the recorded pa site (S15/24) within the development site (recommended that land be amalgamated with the adjoining local purpose reserve) • Addition of a note to the site development plan outlining the need to comply with the HNZPTA in relation to any disturbance of recorded or unrecorded archaeology triggering the Authority application process. Support PC37 in principle subject to the inclusion of plan change provisions directing the use of agreed accidental discovery protocols for the discovery of any further archaeological sites during earthworks (either as an advice note or rule).
240/8	Support in Part	Cultural Heritage	The Chamber acknowledges the importance of iwi engagement and partnership in planning processes. However, there appears to be insufficient detail regarding iwi involvement, perspectives, and outcomes within the application.	Provide greater clarity on iwi engagement, cultural considerations, and how these have informed the proposal.
253/7	Oppose	Cultural Heritage	The Board recognises the importance of mana whenua involvement in shaping land use outcomes and giving effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Need to ensure that cultural values and outcomes are given appropriate weight in the overall assessment of Proposed Private Plan Change 37.	That clarity be provided on: • The nature and timing of mana whenua engagement in the development of PC37. • How mana whenua values and outcomes are reflected in the structure plan, beyond process-based engagement. • Whether there are opportunities to strengthen cultural, environmental and place-based outcomes through the plan change provisions.
268/28	Neutral	Cultural Heritage	Cultural Impact Assessment and Archaeological Report both recommend that the area near to the identified pā site be protected to avoid destruction of borrow pits and associated features in this location. The Structure Plan Image does not provide any indication that protection will be supported.	That the Structure Plan Image is amended to identify the location of the pā site and associated features.
268/29	Neutral	Cultural Heritage	It is not clear what the narrow strip of Indicative Local Purpose Reserve along the western boundary of the site is intending to achieve and the area should be widened to soften the interface with the Addison Kingsley Reserve.	Confirmation of the purpose along with widening of the Indicative Local Purpose Reserve along the western boundary of the site.
275/1	Oppose	Cultural Heritage	**Protection of cultural landscapes and wāhi tūpuna** Iwi expectations around protecting culturally significant sites, particularly the pā site and associated features.	Amend the Structure Plan to show the pā site

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			Seeking amendments so that these areas are identified and protected at structure plan level, rather than deferred to later consent stages. • This aligns strongly with iwi aspirations for early recognition and spatial acknowledgement of whakapapa and history, rather than relying on developer discretion. The call to amend the Structure Plan Image to show the pā site provides visibility, certainty, and mana to these cultural landscapes. Iwi benefit: Cultural values are embedded in planning documentation, not treated as an afterthought.	Seeks early identification and protection of the pā site and associated features within the Structure Plan
275/2	Oppose	Cultural Heritage	**Strengthening the greenbelt as more than a token reserve** The narrow, fragmented, and ambiguous greenbelt configuration, particularly The strip along the Waikato River, and the western interface adjoining Addison Kingsley Reserve. These changes directly reflect iwi aspirations that greenbelts should function as living cultural landscapes and ecological corridors, not simply leftover buffers. Iwi benefit: Moves the greenbelt closer to a values-based landscape that supports kaitiakitanga, cultural connection, and intergenerational wellbeing.	Seek, the widening reserve areas, clarification of reserve purpose and improved connectivity within the open space network. • Push back against narrow or fragmented greenbelt design, especially along the Waikato River margin • Requests clearer mapping of reserves, green corridors, pedestrian and cycle links • Calls for clarification of the purpose, width, and function of the greenbelt and reserves
275/3	Oppose	Cultural Heritage	**Support for native planting and tikanga-aligned ecology** Highlighting a tension between proposed fast-growing exotics and the Cultural Impact Assessment's preference for native vegetation. It asks for reconsideration of exotic planting due to cultural incongruence, long-term maintenance risks, potential ecological harm. This is significant for iwi, as native planting is directly linked to cultural identity, mātauranga Māori, and customary relationships with land. Iwi benefit: The draft gives formal weight to tikanga-informed ecological outcomes, not just engineering or visual amenity.	Reconsideration of exotic planting due to cultural incongruence, long-term maintenance risks, potential ecological harm • Identify misalignment between technical/ecological reports and cultural impact assessment • Seeks stronger controls around lighting (LMA), bat habitat, and ecological mitigation near cultural sites
275/4	Oppose	Cultural Heritage	**Greenbelt risks becoming a "maintenance liability" rather than a cultural asset** Seeking clarity on Council responsibilities for accepting restored gullies and reserves, it also implicitly flags a risk: • that greenbelt areas may be engineered stormwater solutions rather than culturally-enriched landscapes and • that long-term governance, resourcing, and iwi partnership in management are not yet defined. From an iwi perspective, the concern is not just who pays, but who holds authority, voice, and tikanga over these spaces once vested. Residual concern: Without explicit co-governance or partnership mechanisms, the greenbelt may fall short of iwi aspirations for rangatiratanga and relational stewardship.	Seeking clarity on Council responsibilities for accepting restored gullies and reserves • Questions reliance on Private Development Agreements (PDAs) to resolve • Calls for developers — not Council — to bear costs of infrastructure and landscape creation
275/5	Oppose	Cultural Heritage	**Connectivity is still conceptual, not relational** Although the draft pushes for clearer pedestrian and cycle links within and through the greenbelt, these are framed primarily as transport connections and recreational networks. There is no explicit framing of cultural connectivity — such as linking people to: • The river as a tupuna • Pā sites as living heritage • Stories, naming, or narrative landscapes A gap between technical planning language and iwi worldviews. Residual concern: The opportunity for the greenbelt to express identity, story, and place-making remains largely untapped.	Not specified
275/6	Oppose	Cultural Heritage	**Development pressure versus long-term cultural integrity** The submission is clearly concerned about out-of-sequence development and infrastructure strain, but from an indigenous standpoint, the deeper issue is whether accelerating development risks compromising the integrity of the greenbelt as a buffer between Leamington communities, the river, and cultural sites. The draft raises the economic and infrastructure risks well, but mana whenua may still be concerned that once zoning is established, pressure to intensify adjacent to the greenbelt will grow.	Not specified

Character

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
8/4	Oppose	Character	I am very opposed to this. If we want to keep Cambridge beautiful we don't need more housing.	That council do not rezone this land.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
44/3	Oppose	Character	Expanding a town outwards does more harm than good. Change of character of the town.	Do not rezone this land. Encourage productive use of it
48/1	Oppose	Character	I grew up in Cambridge my whole life since the early 90s. It used to be an amazing town filled with huge community spirit & had enough infrastructure to support it plus a decent council. I spent a decade in Melbourne & returned in 2022. Unfortunately in that time Cambridge has been sold to developers & lost it's charm entirely. It is absolutely bursting at the seams and has a Council that is incompetent from top to bottom.	Not go ahead with this change. You need to sort out Cambridge & Leamington as they currently are.
56/3	Oppose	Character	Scale and impact on community character: The proposed development represents a substantial increase in housing relative to the existing Leamington community. The scale is disproportionate and risks fundamentally altering the character of the area without appropriate transitional planning. The character of Cambridge is what everybody loves about it, is it on it's way to being lost. We also love that Leamington is surrounded by greenery, rural land, it is such a beautiful outlook	**Primary relief:** Decline Private Plan Change 37 in its current form. **Alternative relief** (if the plan change is approved in some form): • Reduce the scale and staging of development to align with confirmed infrastructure capacity and funding. • Amend the structure plan to provide Improved connectivity with existing Leamington areas and adequate public open space, • Protection of environmental features and ecological values.
79/2	Oppose	Character	Another part of Cambridge's rural character will be lost along with other long term land use options so at least get it right.	Fix the infrastructure and then talk about growth or this will be 'just be more growth for the sake of it
84/2	Oppose	Character	I think the culture and character of Cambridge will be adversely affected by an increase in local population from this development.	To oppose the request for rezoning
91/4	Oppose	Character	The proposed density of 25 dwellings per hectare is exceptionally high for a rural-fringe location. This will result in thousands of additional vehicle movements daily onto Maungatautari Road and Wordsworth Street. The proposed Medium Density zoning is a total departure from the established "town meets-country" character of the area. It replaces green vistas with a dense, urban landscape that is entirely out of character for the Leamington fringe.	I seek that the Waipa District Council decline Private Plan Change 37 in its entirety.
96/2	Oppose	Character	The town needs to keep its identity of a smaller boutique town and such a large increase of housing will erode the towns unique character.	Decline the rezoning of the 98.6 hectares of land to Medium Density
132/1	Oppose	Character	The proposed medium density housing is out of character with this part of Cambridge and does not align with the existing rural-edge and low-density feel of the area. The scale and intensity of development risks undermining the amenity and character that residents value.	I seek that Council decline the plan change in its current form.
135/1	Oppose	Character	I have lived at my address since I bought my house in 1990, with the knowledge that I would have a degree of privacy from the green belt. I thought that this would also maintain the value of my property. My observation is that any development in the proposed area would eventually reduce our neighbourhood to something similar to the Te Awa development struggling with major traffic and noise. I believe that my Green belt views would have to be preserved. Perhaps I would be entitled to a financial reimbursement for a likely property devaluation.	No plan change
136/3	Oppose	Character	What is most upsetting is the continued erosion of the character of our neighbourhood. Many of us moved here because of the feel of Cambridge — the space, the sense of community, and the style of homes. We have already seen changes in recent years that have started to shift that character, and this proposal feels like another step too far. It no longer feels like thoughtful growth — it feels like our town is being pushed beyond what it can reasonably handle.	reconsider this plan change and put the needs of the current community first. Increased green zones and native planting.
150/3	Oppose	Character	We are renown for being a town of character and this is rapidly disappearing with infill housing and major subdivisions catering for people who wish to move here and in the process, destroying what makes us desirable. I would like to see growth slowed down, retain our character rather than become a satellite city of Hamilton. Keep us a standalone desirable small town destination.	Reject the application for Private Plan Change 37 Rider Park
158/2	Oppose	Character	Loss of privacy and neighbourhood character, that's almost gone now (thanks Council).	Not specified
163/3	Oppose	Character	The scale and density of this proposal are out of keeping with the ambience and character of Cambridge. This will lead to more congestion on roads already under pressure. Another shopping centre is not needed at this time. The disruption to nearby residents will be huge with traffic, dust, noise etc. This will detract from a beautiful rural cycleway which is enjoyed by many residents.	I seek a rejection of the proposal for the rezoning of this land by Milan Park Stud, the original smaller deferred growth expansion plan be adhered to as outlined in the existing District Plan, the majority of this land be retained as productive farmland and the character and ambience of Cambridge be protected.
164/4	Oppose	Character	Likely effects for nearby residents - Loss of amenity, privacy, openness and neighbourhood character.	To oppose the housing development. The Cambridge infrastructure needs development before anything like this.
169/3	Oppose	Character	It is going to impact my day to day life. Reduced comfort, privacy, open space, and the overall character of the area	I oppose the Plan Change

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
190/1	Oppose	Character	The relentless development of Cambridge and Leamington is spoiling the character of this small historic town. Maungatautari Road is one of the most beautiful roads in Waipa, travelled along by visitors to our area for events at the lake and Takapoto, it's character should be protected against the plans of one family to make millions of dollars.	That they deny the change of plan 37 and maintain the status quo: the 98 hectares on the southeastern side of Leamington should remain as a rural zone for agricultural enterprises.
191/5	Oppose	Character	Significant amenity destruction will be caused and the visual impact from both the Cambridge golf course and the adjacent streets and reserves in Leamington. Such a large-scale development directly adjacent to the river and sensitive cultural and environmental sites will be devastating.	Reject the application for the private plan change so generations of family's can continue to live and enjoy the amenity that currently exits. Keep the growth within the current plan area
192/2	Oppose	Character	The street is, and has, for over 40 years, been a quiet and prestigious residential area. Our concern is the temptation for the street to be converted into a main thoroughfare accessway to the lower half of the development. The impact on Addison Street locals would be increased exposure to congestion, noise, danger, and home/property security. The tone of the area is currently high-quality residential, and this has even been signalled by the Council through their sale of expensive riverbank sections. Any change to the purpose of the street would adversely affect this tone and our property values.	Assurance from the developer and Council that Addison Street will remain in its current state i.e. a quiet residential street and not a main throughway to the new development.
202/3	Oppose	Character	The development is not in keeping with the rural setting of Pukekura.	The Council should not approve this change to plan due to the importance of maintaining rural land.
203/3	Oppose	Character	The scale and density are out of keeping with the established feel and character of Cambridge.	No, this development & private plan change 37 cannot go ahead
209/3	Oppose	Character	The scale and density are out of keeping with the established feel and character of Cambridge.	To ban this subdivision at the scale that it is.
215/4	Oppose	Character	The submitters' property forms part of a long-established area of Cambridge characterised by larger holdings, open space, and an urban edge/rural environment. The proposal will result in a significant and permanent change in character, transitioning the area from an urban edge environment to a primary entrance to a large-scale residential development. This will impact visual amenity, privacy and openness, noise and lighting environment overall residential character.	Decline the plan change in its current form; or Alternatively, require that development: • includes measures to mitigate effects on directly affected properties, particularly along Maungatautari Road • Recognises that the submitters' properties are located directly opposite the proposed southern access and requires specific, site-responsive mitigation measures to address frontage-level effects, including traffic, safety, noise, lighting, and visual impacts from the outset of development
216/3	Oppose	Character	We chose to leave a busy city for the intimacy of a rather quiet small town that is self sufficient. That has changed recently with existing and recently completed developments in the Cambridge area. That small town feeling is nearly lost. It is what separates Cambridge from other areas, including Hamilton. We chose Cambridge to raise our children for that safe small town charm. Please do not take that away with this proposed change. We as residents in Leamington are feeling the strain already of developments. We intend to retire here, we enjoy our home, town and community for the small time feel. Having construction and it's associated issues to the local environment is not welcomed. Please consider us residents	To consider existing residents and rate payers like myself, the impact it will have. To discard the entire PC. That is a simple and only request.
217/1	Oppose	Character	Since moving here in late 2014 from Wellington, having been attracted by many things about Cambridge, not least its visual appeal, I have watched with dismay as the small town has become ever larger. I have watched the town creep ever westward and have to say that I hope that when it inevitably reaches the Velodrome, that it goes no further. We do NOT want to be joined to Hamilton! Now to hear that wealthy equestrian landowners wish to get permission to build 1250+ homes to the southeast of the town reaching out towards the beautiful Lake Karapiro is a thought just too much to bear. The council needs to learn to say NO. The council needs to realise that not ALL growth is either wanted by the present population or good for the town.	Reject this application and do not make the plan change 37.
218/9	Oppose	Character	The impact on the reserve must be properly considered. It currently has a valued rural character, which will be significantly compromised if medium-density residential zoning is allowed to directly adjoin it. There is also the issue of protecting the native bats in the area and pa sites at the end of Addison Street.	Decline the application.
222/2	Oppose	Character	Opposed to the significant change this development will bring to the existing environment. The area currently has a residential character that supports community wellbeing and quality of life. This will negatively affect residents' health, comfort, and ability to enjoy their homes. Once completed, the increased traffic, loss of quieter surroundings, and ongoing pressure on infrastructure will permanently alter the character of the neighbourhood.	To leave the zone for rural use not change to residential zoning

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
225/5	Oppose	Character	Concerned about the impact on the reserve and surrounding open space areas. Based on my experience of the area, there is currently a clear sense of openness and a transition between the urban area and the surrounding rural environment. This contributes to the amenity experienced by users of the town belt walk, including a sense of space, outlook, and connection to a more rural landscape. The introduction of medium density residential development in this location would significantly alter this experience, resulting in a more continuous and visually dominant built form and reducing the sense of openness that currently exists, which is not anticipated in a rural zoned environment	I oppose the proposed plan change
225/6	Oppose	Character	The landscape assessment discusses mitigation measures such as planting and edge treatment. However, it is not clear to me how these measures will be secured through the District Plan provisions. In particular, I have not been able to identify any specific controls relating to setbacks, buffer widths, or planting requirements along the edge adjoining the reserve and open space areas. Without clear and enforceable rules, I am concerned that the proposed landscape mitigation may not be implemented in a way that adequately maintains the existing amenity values of the area.	I oppose the proposed plan change
226/2	Oppose	Character	Strongly against this development taking place as the impact on Leamington and Cambridge as a community and township is going to be significantly affected forever if this goes ahead. Our house in particular is along Carlyle Street and will be directly affected In many ways. Our peaceful views of the country side will be stripped from us	I would like this plan to be scrapped or at the very least compensated for the financial loss which this will impact on the value of our property.
227/4	Oppose	Character	The proposal will result in the loss of environmentally valuable rural land and green space at the Leamington edge, with consequential effects on biodiversity, ecological corridors and local landscape character. We consider that the permanent loss of the green space, together with construction impacts over a long period, will erode the local identity and atmosphere that makes Leamington a pleasant and desirable place to live.	That Council reject Private Plan Change PC37.
227/7	Oppose	Character	We will be significantly and adversely impacted by the cumulative area-wide effects of this development particularly increased traffic congestion, greater pressure on schools and other amenities and services, and the irreversible loss of the green-edge character and atmosphere that is a key element of what makes Leamington a pleasant and desirable place to live. We are concerned that approving PC37 as it stands, would materially degrade the local environment, lifestyle, and wellbeing of existing residents, and doesn't provide clear, timely and equitable benefits to the wider community.	That Council reject Private Plan Change PC37.
228/1	Oppose	Character	Adding such a large number of properties in this location will significantly change the feel and character of the area. We currently have beautiful views of the rural countryside when recreating along the green belt. However, expansion of housing into this area will replace the rural scenery with a heavily built environment and will change how people enjoy and use the green belt. The Leamington tree trust walkway through the cemetery is a quiet walkway with scenic views. I walk through this track regularly. Not only will a housing development ruin the scenery of this beautiful walk but I believe it will become a busy used track.	I am seeking council to not allow the proposed changes to be approved
231/4	Oppose	Character	Cambridge is a provincial town, and its character is a defining feature that attracts residents and visitors alike. Many people choose to live here specifically for its scale, atmosphere, and sense of place. Rapid growth without commensurate infrastructure risks eroding this character permanently. The proposed development sits on the boundary between urban and rural land, close by access to Lake Karapiro and adjoining recreational areas. It also partly lies along a popular cycling route, drawing both locals and visitors. Increased traffic, congestion, and urbanisation in this area will detract from its recreational value and compromise cyclist safety. Unmanaged growth at this pace threatens to undermine the very qualities that support the town's social and economic vitality, its point of difference that make it a place to visit.	I urge Council to reconsider this proposal until comprehensive infrastructure planning—including transport, bridges, parking, and safety measures—is demonstrably in place. Growth should be carefully staged, aligned with infrastructure delivery, and designed to protect Cambridge's unique character and liveability.
232/1	Oppose	Character	The Rural zoning of the Cambridge Golf Club and the land within the immediate surrounding area contributes to the overall player experience and amenity of Cambridge Golf Course. The proposal to rezone approximately 52.89 hectares of Rural Zoned land to Medium Density Residential Zone and the establishment of a residential area in this location has the potential to significantly impact upon the overall player experience and rural amenity values at Cambridge Golf Club.	That Waipa District Council reject the Proposed Plan Change unless and until all of the following are addressed: • Covenants being registered on the titles of the land within the Proposed Plan Change that is currently zoned Rural Zone in the Waipa District Plan which is located north of the Deferred Residential Zone (and is proposed to be rezoned) that prevent the current and future owners and occupiers of the aforementioned land from lodging complaints or submissions in

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
				opposition to the recreation and function related activities and development at the Cambridge Golf Club site (including future development); and • Consent Notices being registered on the titles of the land within the Proposed Plan Change that is currently zoned Rural Zone in the Waipa District Plan which is located north of the Deferred Residential Zone (and is proposed to be rezoned) - duplicating the wording set out in the above Covenants. Alternatively, if Council is not mindful to accept the Proposed Plan Change subject to the above amendments and relief sought, Cambridge Golf Club request that the Proposed Plan Change be rejected in relation to the Rual Zoned land north of the Deferred Residential Zone.
238/4	Oppose	Character	The impacts of this plan change on the town belt reserve do not appear to have been fully addressed. I am concerned the rural character and amenity of the reserve will be significantly compromised if medium-density residential zoning is allowed to directly adjoin it. The application refers to 'high level design principles' to soften effects on the reserve; however, I am seeking clearer assurance about how these principles would be implemented and enforced. Without clear, enforceable provisions, I am concerned that buildings could be constructed close to this boundary in a way that materially affects the reserve's amenity.	Decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37 (Rider Park Structure Plan). Alternatively, if Council is minded to approve all or part of the plan change, approve it only with whatever amendments, staging, and/or conditions Council considers appropriate to address the concerns raised in submissions and evidence (including any further information, assessment, or consultation Council considers necessary). Grant any other relief that Council considers appropriate and consistent with the purpose of the plan change process.
241/10	Oppose	Character	The development is also out of character with the rest of the area which will lose its tranquil, rural feel. It is an environment that currently draws people to the area. The proposal puts at risk Cambridge's appeal to visitors with commensurate adverse financial impacts on traders.	That the proposed plan change be rejected
250/2	Oppose	Character	Cambridge was once a nice quiet peaceful town. It is now grid locked with large trucks and school traffic and after 5 pm traffic. I ask the Council to please stop ruining our unique town of Cambridge.	To not allow the Proposed Private Plan Change 37 to go through
252/1	Oppose	Character	We are here because we want our rural amenity and have lived here 26 years. This is not what we bought the property for, and we do not agree that we've been consulted with and do not agree with the proposed change. The proposed plan change does not benefit us in any way but asks us to give up our chosen lifestyle and retirement plans. We enjoy living within green space, with livestock around and do not see why we should cede this for somebody's profit. We did receive the email dated 12th April 2023, which stated that if we didn't respond, Paul Roycroft would contact us. We have not received any other contact since that date. Any assumption that no contact equals agreement to the proposed change is completely false.	That Council does not proceed with this proposed plan change.
257/5	Oppose	Character	The impact on the reserve/green belt, in the vicinity of Addison Street must be properly considered. It currently has a valued rural character which will be significantly compromised if medium-density residential zoning is allowed to directly adjoin it.	Decline
261/8	Oppose	Character	One of Cambridge's defining features is the interface between town and surrounding rural and equine land uses. These green buffers and horse paddocks contribute significantly to the town's identity, amenity value, and sense of space. The gradual erosion of these edges risks losing the very characteristics that make Cambridge distinct compared to other rapidly growing urban areas. - I appreciate this plan retains some of the green belt and has some designs to keep it green etc. but just wanted to note that we run the risk of being an overnight massive urban sprawl.	Not specified
262/7	Oppose	Character	Our property currently enjoys wide rural vistas, open space, established trees, birdlife, quiet roads, and a sense of separation from the more intensive urban parts of Cambridge. PPC37 would fundamentally change that environment. The sense of openness and rural outlook that we currently enjoy would be replaced by an urban edge. The change would be especially difficult because it is proposed to occur now, well ahead of the timeframe that residents could reasonably have expected from the existing planning framework.	We seek that Proposed Private Plan Change 37 be declined in full. In the alternative, if the Hearing Panel is not minded to decline the plan change entirely, we seek the following relief: • That the proposal be reduced in scale and density to align with the Deferred Residential framework, and protect the amenity, character and functioning of Leamington and Cambridge.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
263/2	Oppose	Character	Residents in these areas should be able to enjoy the green open spaces they have become accustomed. Additional noise, dust and disruption to already established areas - why should current residents have to endure years of development.	To not approve this Plan change
264/1	Oppose	Character	We bought here for the rural outlook and character. We are concerned about the congestion of our roads and on our bridges and the added disruption that construction vehicles and new residents will cause. Our emergency vehicles will be affected even more than now. We are concerned about the further erosion of the character of Cambridge.	That: • further growth areas are deferred until we have adequate access across the Waikato river • our rural land and ecosystem is not destroyed by further pillaging • the character and charm of our town is not destroyed • construction noise, dust and effects of heavy vehicles do not affect our quality of choice of residence or our roads are not further congested.
271/3	Oppose	Character	The proposed medium-density residential zoning is entirely out of keeping with the established character and "feel" of Cambridge and the Leamington edge. The shift from a rural/equine landscape to high-intensity urban development does not respect the surrounding neighbourhood and will result in a permanent loss of amenity, privacy, and openness.	Decline Private Plan Change 37 in its entirety, or in the alternative, should the Council be minded to approve any part of the plan change, I seek that: • Stricter performance standards and setbacks are imposed for the boundary interface with existing residential properties to protect the privacy and amenity of current residents. • A significant reduction in density is required to ensure the development is consistent with the established character of the Leamington/Cambridge area, rather than the high-intensity "urban" model currently proposed.

Stormwater Management

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
238/6	Oppose	Stormwater Management	I am concerned that stormwater runoff from a large medium-density development (approximately 98 hectares) could adversely affect the water quality of the creek within the reserve and increase erosion. I have already observed erosion in parts of the sandy loam banks during storm events, and I am worried this could worsen under the proposed stormwater approach.	Decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37 (Rider Park Structure Plan). Alternatively, if Council is minded to approve all or part of the plan change, approve it only with whatever amendments, staging, and/or conditions Council considers appropriate to address the concerns raised in submissions and evidence (including any further information, assessment, or consultation Council considers necessary). Grant any other relief that Council considers appropriate and consistent with the purpose of the plan change process. That the applicant provide clear information on baseline water quality, erosion risks, and the specific mitigation/management measures that will be required and monitored over time.
268/10	Neutral	Stormwater Management	Early consideration of water sensitive design, including rainwater harvesting and greywater reuse, is recommended to manage long term demand and support climate change mitigation.	That the Structure Plan is amended to include a rule(s) requiring water sensitive design assessment at the subdivision stage to manage long term demand and support climate change mitigation.
268/11	Neutral	Stormwater Management	The gully that Catchments 1 - 4 are proposed to discharge to will need extensive planting and have appropriate design outlets that ensure no scour and erosion occurs downstream. The robust planting and maintenance will need to be confirmed and well implemented to ensure effectiveness. Developers must be responsible for ensuring establishment is completed prior to vesting the reserve to Council with appropriate maintenance obligations/duration extensions as and when respective catchments and their respective outlets come online.	The Structure Plan is amended to confirm the implementation and maintenance of planting in the gully, the design requirements of the stormwater outlets, and that developers will be responsible for ensuring establishment is completed prior to vesting to Council.
268/12	Neutral	Stormwater Management	For Catchments 1 – 4, on-lot soakage is supported as a primary stormwater management approach (subject to confirmation by site-specific testing at subdivision stage).	That the Structure Plan confirms that Catchments 1 – 4 are suitable for on-lot soakage is appropriate and the actual design will need to be confirmed by site-specific testing at subdivision stage.
268/13	Neutral	Stormwater Management	As Catchment 6 and potentially parts of Catchment 5 are underlain by Taupo Pumice Alluvium, no direct on-lot soakage or discharge of stormwater should be permitted, and alternative stormwater solutions (e.g. lined rain gardens, detention/reuse tanks) will be required.	Confirmation as to whether parts of Catchment 5 are not suitable for direct on-lot soakage or discharge of stormwater. The Structure Plan be amended to identify that direct on-lot soakage or discharge of stormwater is not permitted Catchment 6 (and parts of Catchment 5 if required) and alternative

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
				stormwater solutions (e.g. lined rain gardens, detention/reuse tanks) will be required.
268/14	Neutral	Stormwater Management	As indicated by the slope stability analysis, on-lot soakage or discharge of stormwater should not be permitted within 20m of the riverbank, 5m from gully crest or in areas underlain by Taupo Pumice Alluvium.	The Structure Plan be amended to identify that on-lot soakage or discharge of stormwater is not permitted within 20m of the riverbank, 5m from gully crest or in areas underlain by Taupo Pumice Alluvium.
268/15	Neutral	Stormwater Management	While perched groundwater is generally greater than 5m below ground level, Council expects a minimum of one year of baseline groundwater monitoring prior to detailed design and that soakage systems are not located in areas with high groundwater or Taupo Pumice Alluvium soils.	That the Structure Plan is amended to require a minimum of one year of baseline groundwater monitoring prior to detailed design and that soakage systems are not located in areas with high groundwater or Taupo Pumice Alluvium soils.
268/16	Neutral	Stormwater Management	All existing overland flow paths must be maintained and not obstructed by development. Detailed bespoke design for appropriate crossing points under road networks would be required at the subdivision stage to fully understand whether box or piped culverts are appropriate.	The Structure Plan be amended to identify that overland flow paths must be maintained and not obstructed, and that crossing points under road networks will require detailed bespoke design at the subdivision stage.
268/17	Neutral	Stormwater Management	To support climate resilience, as indicated in the Stormwater Management Plan and Climate Change Assessment, all stormwater management devices must be sized using RCP8.5 rainfall projections for 2090 and the need for on-site water sensitivity solutions (reuse - rainwater tanks, greywater systems) should be confirmed at the subdivision stage.	That the Structure Plan is amended to identify all stormwater management devices must be sized using RCP8.5 rainfall projections for 2090 and the need for on-site water sensitivity solutions should be confirmed at the subdivision stage.
268/18	Neutral	Stormwater Management	The Structure Plan must ensure that the natural hydrology is maintained, sensitive receiving environments are protected, and all stormwater management is robustly designed for climate change, geotechnical, and groundwater constraints.	That the Structure Plan be amended so it identifies that the natural hydrology must be maintained, sensitive receiving environments must be protected, and all stormwater management must be designed for climate change, geotechnical, and groundwater constraints.

Amenity Values

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
5/6	Oppose	Amenity	The increase in houses and cars this development will bring will also lead to increased air and noise pollution, in addition to the destruction the building works will cause.	To not allow development surrounding the nature reserve and pa site.
11/2	Oppose	Amenity	This would also add significant noise and pollution to the area if it goes ahead.	Please do not proceed with this proposal.
95/3	Oppose	Amenity	Environmental issues that cause more pressure on local infrastructures and natural resources. Increased noise and light pollution. I feel that Council are doing the tick box on asking our views but it will be already decided .	Do not build on the land. How many more estates can we have in Cambridge
133/1	Oppose	Amenity	My concerns are that the Wordsworth St park have children playing there regularly, big trucks going pass on a daily basis will be of great concern to the parents. Noises of the trucks going pass would not be a pleasant time for a mother who's baby is sleeping or trying to sleep at the park. All it takes is 1 small child to run onto the road by mistake. Not happy about the amount of dust being thrown into the air during a summer period. Children/adults use the rugby fields often, and with the dust in the air on a windy day, not good. This area has an abundance of elderly people living here, they enjoy their walks, they enjoy the quiet times. Let's think about the children and the elderly. The environmental impact would be a huge strain on a great deal of people. I know it's all about the money, but what about humanity .	Not specified
136/4	Oppose	Amenity	There is also the very real concern of what residents will have to live through during construction. Years of noise, dust, heavy vehicles, and disruption is not a small thing. It affects our wellbeing, our ability to enjoy our homes, and the sense of peace we currently have.	reconsider this plan change and put the needs of the current community first.
145/3	Oppose	Amenity	Residents should not be expected to absorb years of avoidable noise, dust, and disruption.	That Council do not proceed with the implementation of Private Plan Change 37 - Rider Park Structure Plan
152/3	Oppose	Amenity	Dust and noise. Morrinsville has a similar development (still ongoing) and the dust and noise from it has caused issues for the residential areas surrounding it. In short PS37 will increase existing pressures on infrastructure, increase noise, dust, and pollution. It will change the feel of the area.	Not specified

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
154/3	Oppose	Amenity	Local residents along the lower part of Shakespeare Street already endure significant traffic noise and disturbance with heavy vehicles engine breaking down the hill at all times day and night, this should not be allowed to expand exponentially with the introduction of many years of construction traffic.	Decline the submission
164/2	Oppose	Amenity	Likely effects for nearby residents - Construction noise, vibration and heavy vehicle movements, dust, inconvenience and prolonged disruption during earthworks and building.	To oppose the housing development. The Cambridge infrastructure needs development before anything like this.
169/2	Oppose	Amenity	It is going to impact my day to day life. • Increased noise, shaking, and frequent movement of large construction vehicles • Dust, general inconvenience, and extended disturbance during site preparation and building work Heavier traffic on roads that are already busy	I oppose the Plan Change
170/3	Oppose	Amenity	My main issue with this development is the damage that my house will sustain with the heavy earth moving traffic and trucks. The trucks that go pass already impact our house making it shake when they go pass. (This has become worst since the development of houses outside the greenbelt) I would like to know who will fit the bill if our house is damaged e.g. cracked foundations house walls etc.	Engineer reports be done on all houses pre and post along Browning Street to ensure damaged addressed and accountable. Fixing our properties and houses back to their predevelopment state at no costs to the home owner.
171/2	Oppose	Amenity	Our residence is close to the planned development, and heavy vehicles and construction would be a major hindrance, the environmental aspects like dust etc will have an effect on our health as my wife already has lung issues at present	Not specified
177/2	Oppose	Amenity	The Dust and Noise already created by the trucks is enough, we do not need any more. Our Houses are rattling, we have cracks in our gib because these trucks go fast and the whole house rattles. In the time I have taken to do this submission (15-20 Minutes) 15 Truck and trailer units have driven past my house in Browning Street.	I think the subdivision should be put on hold until infrastructure has been improved. I believe a bridge at the south end of the expressway into Leamington is needed before more subdivisions.
178/7	Oppose	Amenity	There is insufficient detail regarding how construction and development waste will be managed, including disposal, recycling, and control of contaminants. Noise, vibration, and dust impacts during construction also raise concerns for nearby residents.	That the Council decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37 as notified, or substantially amend it to address the matters raised in this submission before any approval is considered. Clear limits, monitoring, and enforcement mechanisms must be specified to protect community health and wellbeing. Construction impacts must be minimised through careful staging and strong conditions applied through the District Plan.
200/3	Oppose	Amenity	The noise and disruption to residents in the long established neighbouring streets during construction is unreasonable given the detrimental impact the subdivision will have on the quality of life of the residents.	To refuse the plan change to medium density housing for this land.
203/5	Oppose	Amenity	Residents should not be expected to absorb years of avoidable noise, dust and disruption. We have all settled and established our lives here for the quietness and peace that a smaller town/village offers. The noise, the vibration and heavy vehicle movement will make life very unpleasant for us all. The dust, inconvenience and prolonged disruption during earthworks and building will be severe.	No, this development & private plan change 37 cannot go ahead
209/2	Oppose	Amenity	Residents should not be expected to absorb years of avoidable noise, dust and disruption.	To ban this subdivision at the scale that it is.
219/3	Oppose	Amenity	My key concerns are years of construction noise, dust, earthworks and disruption.	That the Proposed Private Plan Change 37 be declined in full
222/3	Oppose	Amenity	Construction phase alone raises serious concerns regarding air quality due to dust, ongoing noise disruption, and safety risks, particularly for pedestrians and nearby households. The introduction of large-scale development will result in increased noise, dust, and the regular movement of trucks and machinery over an extended period of time.	To leave the zone for rural use not change to residential zoning
226/1	Oppose	Amenity	Strongly against this development taking place as the impact on Leamington and Cambridge as a community and township is going to be significantly affected forever if this goes ahead. Our house in particular is along Carlyle Street and will be directly affected In many ways. We will be living face to face with a construction site for many years which will impact hugely on resale for our house in the near future. A construction site of this magnitude will heavily impact our lives throughout the process such as dust, noise and vehicles.	I would like this plan to be scrapped or at the very least compensated for the financial loss which this will impact on the value of our property.
231/3	Oppose	Amenity	Prolonged construction phase associated with a development of this size will result in sustained noise, dust, vibration, and disruption for surrounding communities. The daily movement of heavy vehicles through local streets will further compound these impacts and negatively affect residents' wellbeing and quality of life over many years.	I urge Council to reconsider this proposal until comprehensive infrastructure planning—including transport, bridges, parking, and safety measures—is demonstrably in place. Growth should be carefully staged, aligned with infrastructure delivery, and designed to protect Cambridge's unique character and liveability.
241/1	Oppose	Amenity	Chief among my concerns is the significant adverse effects of increased and long term traffic movements and congestion outside my property relating to noise, air pollution, vibration from very large and heavy commercial vehicles and the increase in risk to personal safety on accessing or leaving my driveway.	That the proposed plan change be rejected

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
246/2	Oppose	Amenity	object to PC37 in its entirety because of prolonged disruption, dust and inconvenience throughout the building process for Leamington residents.	That this plan be declined in its totality, or at least deferred until infrastructure is addressed satisfactorily
262/8	Oppose	Amenity	We are particularly concerned about the long construction period and the day-to-day effects this would have on our family. Noise, dust, contractor traffic, earthworks, machinery, loss of privacy, visual intrusion and increased vehicle movements would all materially reduce our ability to peacefully enjoy our home and outdoor areas. PPC37 would impose a sudden, premature and very substantial change on the local environment and on neighbouring families such as ours, without the necessary infrastructure or proper sequencing in place.	We seek that Proposed Private Plan Change 37 be declined in full. In the alternative, if the Hearing Panel is not minded to decline the plan change entirely, we seek the following relief: That full earthworks, stormwater, servicing and downstream effects be quantified and independently tested before any rezoning is considered.
271/4	Oppose	Amenity	I will be directly and detrimentally affected by construction Impacts: I do not accept that residents should absorb years of avoidable noise, vibration, dust, and heavy vehicle movements. This prolonged disruption will severely impact our quality of life and wellbeing.	Decline Private Plan Change 37 in its entirety, or in the alternative, should the Council be minded to approve any part of the plan change, I seek that: comprehensive construction management triggers that strictly limit noise, dust, and heavy vehicle movements to standard business hours are implemented, with independent monitoring paid for by the developer.
272/1	Neutral	Amenity	In a time where there is a housing crisis we should be looking hard at new housing opportunities. Having said that, as a resident right next to the proposed development I am interested to hear what environmental (noise, dust, vehicle numbers) mitigations can be done and what penalties there are for infringement.	Not specified
276/2	Oppose	Amenity	We don't need construction noise and dust with heavy vehicles destroying the roads	Not specified

Acid Sulphate Soils

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
274/23	Neutral	Acid Sulphate Soils	WRC's preliminary regional Acid Sulphate Soils Probability spatial layer indicates a high probability of Acid Sulphate Soil occurrence across substantial areas of the southern part of the site, with remaining areas largely having a low probability of Acid Sulphate Soils. However, the regional Acid Sulphate Soil map is mapped at the regional scale and, in this location, the occurrence of high Acid Sulphate Soils probability areas is largely driven by the distribution of poorly drained Gley soils mapped at the regional scale. The property scale soil assessment undertaken as part of the plan change application suggests that, although poorly or very poorly drained soils are present, their location and distribution is likely different and more complex at the property scale compared with the regional scale mapping. We note that when disturbed (e.g. excavated) and exposed to oxygen, Acid Sulphate Soil materials can produce sulfuric acid which can become mobilised following rainfall. Damage to infrastructure (e.g. concrete) and impacts on the environment (e.g. aquatic ecosystems) can result. The potential for the occurrence of Acid Sulphate Soils at the site should be considered in relation to the proposed development and appropriate guidance for their management followed if identified on site.	If Acid Sulphate Soils are identified on the plan change site, ensure appropriate guidance for their management is followed.

Structure Plan

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
252/5	Oppose	Structure Plan	We have not received the mock-up plan, as mentioned in the 12th April email, for our approval. We are concerned that the proposed structure plan does not retain our property as is, showing our land as the site for a proposed school or medium density housing.	That Council does not proceed with this proposed plan change.
268/24	Neutral	Structure Plan	While the Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) identifies that development would be staged, the image does not identify any stage boundaries. Additionally, the image does not identify indicative internal roading or pedestrian / cycle networks. Understanding the intended sequencing of development and network layouts at this stage would enable a better understanding of potential impacts / appropriateness of the proposal.	That the Structure Plan Image is updated to identify proposed stages and indicative internal roading and pedestrian / cycle networks.
268/25	Neutral	Structure Plan	While the AEE identifies that stormwater would be managed within the site using soakage devices, swales, and attenuation basins, the Structure Plan Image does not confirm the indicative locations of such infrastructure.	That the Structure Plan Image is amended to confirm the indicative location of all proposed stormwater infrastructure.

PC37 Submission Summary – By Topic

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
268/31	Neutral	Structure Plan	Paragraphs S27.2.1 – S27.5 and S27.2.7 – S27.2.12 (background of the Waipā District Plan, Waipā 2050 District Growth Strategy, Future Proof and RMA) are not relevant to the future development of the Structure Plan area and should be deleted.	That paragraphs S27.2.1 – S27.5 and S27.2.7 – S27.2.12 be deleted.
268/32	Neutral	Structure Plan	Paragraph S27.2.13 is not clear what the best-practice urban design principles are or how they could be applied to future development.	That paragraph S27.2.13 be amended to identify best-practice urban design principles and how they are to be applied.
268/33	Neutral	Structure Plan	Paragraph S27.2.14 (overview of areas) is not relevant to the future development of the Structure Plan area and should be deleted.	That paragraph S27.2.14 be deleted.
268/34	Neutral	Structure Plan	Paragraph S27.2.15 relates to the current zoning and is therefore are not relevant to the future development of the Structure Plan area and should be deleted.	That paragraph S27.2.15 be deleted.
268/35	Neutral	Structure Plan	Paragraph S27.2.18 does not identify how the key design principles will be achieved, particularly: a. The proposed housing typologies. b. The landscaped pedestrian network details. c. Compact and carbon positive development outcomes. d. Integrated water sensitive planning and design principles.	That paragraph S27.2.18 is amended to identify how the key design principles will be achieved.
268/36	Neutral	Structure Plan	While paragraph S27.2.20 identifies the proposed landscape principles, it is not clear whether they are appropriate or can be achieved at the future development stage. The location and connectivity between indicative blue green corridors, open spaces and green streets have not been provided. Additionally, the Structure Plan does not identify which habitats are proposed to be retained, the contents of the detailed vegetation strategy, and the location of the swale and wetland features.	Consideration as to whether the proposed landscape principles are appropriate and can be achieved at the future development stage.
268/37	Neutral	Structure Plan	The references in paragraphs S27.2.20 and S27.2.23 relating to retaining and planting fast growing exotics are at odds with the Cultural Impact Assessment's preference of using local native vegetation. Additionally, some exotic species can be problematic in terms of seed dispersal resulting in a future weed problem.	Consideration of the appropriateness of retaining and planting exotic vegetation is required in relation to the Cultural Impact Assessment's native vegetation preference and future Council maintenance.
268/38	Neutral	Structure Plan	The open space network paragraphs S27.2.21 to S27.2.26 lack detail to ensure that the outcomes sought would be achieved. Details should be provided in relation to how the Structure Plan interface would achieve a positive relationship with the town belt and what the "communal open spaces framework" is and how it will be achieved.	Paragraphs S27.2.21 to S27.2.26 are amended to detail how the Structure Plan interface would achieve a positive relationship with the town belt and what the "communal open spaces framework" is and how it will be achieved.
268/39	Neutral	Structure Plan	Although paragraph S27.2.22 anticipates that connectivity between and within the reserves will be established through a network of pedestrian and/or cycling links as part of subsequent resource consent applications, as the Structure Plan Image does not identify their location, it is unclear how and whether such connectivity would be achieved via future consent processes.	That Structure Plan Image is updated to identify all proposed reserves and indicative pedestrian and/or cycling links. That paragraph S27.2.22 is amended to identify that the final location and design of any reserve and pedestrian and/or cycling connections will be confirmed as part of subsequent resource consent applications.
268/40	Neutral	Structure Plan	Paragraph S27.2.24 does not identify that the Indicative Local Purpose Reserve along the northern boundary of the Structure Plan area adjacent to the Waikato River would provide public access.	That paragraph S27.2.24 is amended to identify that public access provided in the Indicative Local Purpose Reserve along the northern boundary of the Structure Plan area adjacent to the Waikato River.
268/41	Neutral	Structure Plan	While paragraph S27.2.26 identifies that "the Structure Plan also provides opportunity for the establishment of 'Green Streets' which will connect into the open space network" and "A 'Green Street' network could provide for footpath connections between residential streets and swale or rain garden designs may be incorporated to complement the overall network", the proposed design of the 'Green Streets' or the location of the internal open space and road networks are not identified.	That the proposed 'Green Streets' design details are provided, and the Structure Plan Image is updated to show the indicative location of the internal open space and road networks.
268/42	Neutral	Structure Plan	Although paragraph S27.2.31 identifies that a Private Development Agreement (PDA) would implement a strategic and integrated approach to planning for and managing the extent to which the proposal contributes to transport system, it is unclear what the proposed approach is and therefore whether it is appropriate for it to be left to a PDA.	Confirmation of the details of the proposed strategic and integrated transportation approach and consideration of whether a PDA is appropriate.
268/43	Neutral	Structure Plan	Paragraph S27.2.32 outlines the proposed key principles for stormwater management, but details and location of the indicative management features have not been identified.	Confirmation of the indicative stormwater management feature details and their location identified on the Structure Plan Image.
268/44	Neutral	Structure Plan	The Structure Plan Text does not identify any details in relation to the expected water or wastewater networks.	Consideration of whether the Structure Plan Text should include water and wastewater network details and addition of new sections / paragraphs if required.
268/45	Neutral	Structure Plan	The proposed transportation and three waters infrastructure and restoration / creation of the gullies and reserves should be undertaken by the developer at no cost to Council.	Addition of a new section and paragraph(s) (similar to the paragraph S20.2.26 of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan) clearly outlining

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
				that the transportation and three waters infrastructure, restoration of gullies and creation of reserves are to be undertaken by the developer of each stage and at no cost to Council.
268/46	Neutral	Structure Plan	The Structure Plan Text does not reference long-tailed bats or the outcomes to be achieved via future consent processes (8,420 long-lived tree species, 20,000 native trees, shrubs and herbaceous plants, predator control and monitoring and $200,000 contribution).Reference is considered warranted given the critically endangered status of the species and to ensure that appropriate mitigation measures undertaken at the subdivision stage.	That the status of long-tailed bats and the outcomes to be achieved via future consent processes is added to the Structure Plan Text.
268/47	Neutral	Structure Plan	Paragraph S27.2.33 identifies a list of technical reports that are intended to be read in conjunction with the Structure Plan. It is unclear whether the current technical reports contain sufficient information for Structure Plan to rely on.	Consideration of whether the technical reports provide adequate information to ensure that the outcomes expressed will be achieved.
274/18	Neutral	Structure Plan	The Structure Plan text should clearly reflect the key recommendations of the Ecological Assessment affecting the layout and development of the plan change area. This would ensure future development remains in accordance with the recommendations of the Ecological Assessment and aid in the assessment of future resource consent applications. We recommend the Structure Plan includes descriptions of: • The ecological significance and purpose of the reserve areas, including protection of habitat for long-tailed bats, birds and lizards. • The purpose of the 20m Light Management Area (shown on the Structure Plan map), in accordance with the recommendations of the Ecological Assessment. • Recommendations within the Ecological Assessment to: - Minimise the presence of roads immediately adjacent to proposed reserves and the Rider Park boundary to minimise degradation of bat habitat due to increased lighting. Retain/establish a tall hedge, fence, shelterbelt or other buffer on the boundary of the site and reserves.	Amend the text of proposed Rider Park Structure Plan to better reflect key recommendations of the Ecological Assessment.
274/6	Support	Structure Plan	We support design principles within the proposed Structure Plan that support creating a more compact and carbon positive development, encouraging mode shift and ensuring development has good accessibility for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, including by way of enabling public or active transport.	Retain principles within the Structure Plan relating to compact urban form, encouraging mode shift and ensuring good accessibility, including by way of public and active transport.

Proposed Provisions

Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Topic	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
268/52	Neutral	Proposed Provisions	New Rule 15.4.2.91A – Subdivision Parameters • Although Section 5.6 of the Integrated Traffic Assessment identifies that "a vehicle access restriction is proposed along the Maungatautari Road frontage of the site, to minimise conflict with the Te Awa River Ride shared path", there is no rule proposed to prevent direct access from lots to Maungatautari Road.	That New Rule 15.4.2.91A is amended to add a clause to ensure that there is no direct access from lots or activities to Maungatautari Road and that Rule 15.4.2.8 shall apply to the road.
268/53	Neutral	Proposed Provisions	The gully restoration and the Landscape Concept Plan requirements for each development / subdivision stage need to be more specific to ensure the intended outcomes are achieved.	That New Rule 15.4.2.91A clauses (b) and (c) are amended to list specific minimum requirements for gully restoration planting and Landscape Concept Plans.
268/54	Neutral	Proposed Provisions	New Rule 15.4.2.91B – Subdivision Parameters • As the Structure Plan does not include details of the indicative stage boundaries and internal roading or pedestrian / cycle networks, it is unclear whether the proposed timing triggers and requirements are appropriate. The current wording of New Rule 15.4.2.91B would enable 110 additional dwellings with no upgrades or improvements to the roading network.	Amend the wording to ensure upgrades and improvements to the roading network are to be provided in advance of development.
274/22	Neutral	Proposed Provisions	we highlight the importance of ensuring that all natural hazards are appropriately identified and managed as part of the proposed plan change, including liquefaction, slope instability and flooding.	Ensure all natural hazards are appropriately identified and managed as part of the proposed plan change.